DOCUMENT RESUME

PS 004 763

ED 051 875

TITLE	Conference on Reading and Early Childhood.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	60p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Disadvantaged Youth, *Early Childhood Education, *Early Reading, Elementary Education, Federal Aid, Information Dissemination, Motivation, Negro Youth, Parent Participation, *Reading, *Reading Instruction, Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

Collected in this document are seven papers presented at the Ohio Conference on Reading and Early Childhood: (1) "Kids," Jerome Kagen; (2) "Parents as Partners," Christine F. Branche; (3) "When the Young Child Finds Importance in Reading," Leland B. Jacobs; (4) "Four Questions on Early Childhood Education," Lilian G. Katz; (5) "How to Teach Poor Blacks and Rich Whites to Read," S. Alan Cohen; (6) "Coordination of Regular and Special Programs," Martin L. Stahl; and (7) "Dissemination," Joseph L. Davis. (AJ)

ED051875

PS 004763

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
COLUMBUS, OHIO
1970

Conference on READING & EARLY CHILDHOOD

ED 051 875

Foreword

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is designed to enrich the educational opportunities of the nation's less fortunate children. Since its enactment in 1965, educators in Ohio have made – and are continuing to make – every effort to use the provisions of Title I to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children.

The growing complexities of our society present difficult challenges to both children and adults. Today's educators are in many ways on the frontier of education and should approach the challenges with a spirit of adventure.

The right to communicate has been a vanguard of Ohio Title I programs since they were first initiated. Early childhood education has also been an area of increasing importance. Hence it is fitting and proper that the theme of this conference should be *Reading and Early Childhood.*

Martin W. Essex

Superintendent of Public Instruction
State of Ohio

PS 004763

MARTIN W. ESSEX

Superintendent of Public Instruction
State of Ohio

JEROME KAGAN

Professor
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Kids

Jerome Kagan

My message this morning is relatively clear and unequivocal; it is that a child's motivation is absolutely primary with respect to his progress in school. Psychological factors must also be considered, but if we have to rank order, good academic progress is, in my opinion, top candidate for a child's motivation.

Every society must solve the same set of basic problems: 1. caring for the infant and young child; 2. creation of rules that govern how people should interact with one another; 3. the transmission of skills and values from the adult generation to the child generation.

Our society has difficulty with this last requirement. Unlike primitive communities, we build schools. In doing so we have relegated part of the responsibility for the training of skills to strangers and required the child to learn things that, strictly speaking, were not essential for survival. A child in Africa learns how to hunt, track and ride a horse. He learns it from members of his family. All three skills are so obviously important for survival that he doesn't need any specific reason for working at them; he knows at once that they are important.

Necessity has not been a characteristic of the subjects that we teach in public schools. Until after the First World War, the primary function of the public school was not to teach necessary skills, it was to prepare a priest class. During most of the last three hundred years, school attendance was a ritual to preserve distinction among social classes. Although the American view of public school was always more practical than that of the European, Americans never seriously questioned until the 1940's the premise that school success was not necessary for economic survival. One could be a farmer, one could be a blacksmith, one did not have to go through high school.

The American public school during most of the 19th century saw its role as helping the family build character in young children. The goal of education was to prepare youth to assume a role of power or leadership in the society, and this plan worked very well. Every society requires a small group of people who will assume responsibility for the welfare of others, be it their health, their spiritual enlightenment, their legal prerogatives, or protection from their enemies. In other words, every society needs doctors, lawyers, and Indian chiefs, and we give them responsibility and power over our lives.

What are the ideal personal requirements for those to whom we give this responsibility? First, they must be able to delay gratification of their needs–desires. Second, they have to have standards of honesty and responsibility. Third, they have to be able to commit themselves, and to understand abstract principles.

Our society invented and used with great profit a work sample test to select these people. We used the school. Any person who persists for sixteen years in the school system with acceptable levels of performance and very few sins on his record is more likely to possess the three desired attributes than one who never began the journey, or one who withdrew before it was over. Since the system worked so well, particularly in getting leaders, we were not concerned with school failures. Early failures indicated how sensitive the system was in weeding out those who were not of the proper temperament or personality to care for their fellow men.

Today we live in a different time. This is probably the first period in the history of man that a minimum of twelve years of formal educa-

tion is absolute
vival. Now all o
early failures th
We realize that
serious psycholo
munity, and w
system.

Let us state t
want children t
liefs and motive
ing when they e
these behavior
petent perform
reasonable obed

What are th
are different fro
to believe that i
thing, and we

Finally, we
motives that w
want him to ha
to improve his
finally, we wa
accurately.

The proble
adopt these beh
do not underst
year-old is a
continually lea
ground. Why d
requests we ma
our tendency to

If we want
new behavior,
The person mu
being successfu
he will obtain
new behavior.
vated. Many
with neither t
nor the belief t
bring the desir
to tempt the ch
skills of readin
require of him

There are
motives. One s
on these motiv

During most of the last three hundred years, school attendance was a ritual to preserve distinction among social classes. Although the American view of public school was always more practical than that of the European, Americans never seriously questioned until the 1940's the premise that school success was not necessary for economic survival. One could be a farmer, one could be a blacksmith, one did not have to go through high school.

The American public school during most of the 19th century saw its role as helping the family build character in young children. The goal of education was to prepare youth to assume a role of power or leadership in the society, and this plan worked very well. Every society requires a small group of people who will assume responsibility for the welfare of others, be it their health, their spiritual enlightenment, their legal prerogatives, or protection from their enemies. In other words, every society needs doctors, lawyers, and Indian chiefs, and we give them responsibility and power over our lives.

What are the ideal personal requirements for those to whom we give this responsibility? First, they must be able to delay gratification of their needs—desires. Second, they have to have standards of honesty and responsibility. Third, they have to be able to commit themselves, and to understand abstract principles.

Our society invented and used with great profit a work sample test to select these people. We used the school. Any person who persists for sixteen years in the school system with acceptable levels of performance and very few sins on his record is more likely to possess the three desired attributes than one who never began the journey, or one who withdrew before it was over. Since the system worked so well, particularly in getting leaders, we were not concerned with school failures. Early failures indicated how sensitive the system was in weeding out those who were not of the proper temperament or personality to care for their fellow men.

Today we live in a different time. This is probably the first period in the history of man that a minimum of twelve years of formal education is absolutely necessary for economic survival. Now all of us are concerned with the many early failures that we ignored fifty years ago. We realize that these failures form the basis for serious psychological illness in the entire community, and we must make changes in the system.

Let us state the problem. Parents and teachers want children to develop sets of behavior, beliefs and motives that many children resist adopting when they enter the school system. What are these behaviors? They are persistence, competent performance in the skills taught, and reasonable obedience to teachers' requests.

What are the beliefs that we want? Beliefs are different from behavior. We want the child to believe that intellectual competence is a good thing, and we want him to expect success.

Finally, we have motives. There are two motives that we want the child to adopt. We want him to have a strong desire to understand, to improve his skills for their own sake, and finally, we want him to want to perform accurately.

The problem is that many children do not adopt these behaviors, beliefs or motives and we do not understand why. We say that the six-year-old is a very malleable creature. He is continually learning new things on the playground. Why does he resist adopting the small requests we make of him? One answer lies with our tendency toward coercion.

If we want persistence in the practicing of a new behavior, two requirements must be met. The person must believe that he has a chance of being successful; second, he must believe that he will obtain a desired goal if he perfects that new behavior. In other words, he must be motivated. Many children enter the school system with neither the belief that they will succeed nor the belief that learning to read or write will bring the desired goal. Therefore, it is difficult to tempt the child to work at the very arbitrary skills of reading and spelling and history that we require of him.

There are two ways to change the child's motives. One strategy involves working directly on these motives. What are they? Recognition,

praise from an adult, and the perception of increased similarity to some model, some hero or heroine, are major goals of children.

Most schools adopt a puritan attitude. They behave as if they believe that schools are inherently unattractive. Their strategy is to coerce the child into displaying the required behaviors, trusting that if he displays them long enough, he will eventually come to like them. This argument has some merit. If anyone is forced to play the piano and eventually becomes good at it, he will develop a motive to defend his prior actions, and he will want to practice. The giving of examinations, the support of an army, the playing of cards in the summer cabin begin as reactions to specific pressures, not because we want to do them, but because there is nothing else to do. If we do them long enough, we will develop a motive for them, where initially there was no motive. I am suggesting that that is the philosophy schools adopt. Teach the child reading and adding, and if he eventually becomes good at them, he will learn to like them. This plan works with some children. It does not work with most children because it is most effective when the child selects the behavior to be mastered and least likely when the child is forced to behave in a particular way.

To put it very simply – human beings, all of us, are most likely to rationalize our behavior and make up a motive for our behavior when we believe we selected a course of action. Under these conditions we must explain why we did what we did, and we do so by noting that we wanted that goal. Neither children nor adults are likely to invent a motive to explain their actions in school; mainly, they have been forced to behave that way.

Let me give you an example. If every urban citizen were coerced by law to travel every summer weekend to a noisy, crowded lakeside or seaside town over a highway that had bumper to bumper traffic for four-and-a-half-hours, it is not likely he would want to make the trip as often as he does under present arrangements where he has the option to choose that form of holiday. If one has the freedom to choose, then he invents a reason for the frustrations of the trip; the delights of surf and water are sufficient.

The child is usually forced to learn the academic skills. He feels no need to make up any motive for working at them since he is not given the opportunity to decide that these are, in fact, valuable talents. He does not develop a strong motive for mastery because he has an explanation: teachers and parents make him go to school.

This perception of external pressure has two consequences. It obstructs the development of a motive to master academic tasks and breeds resistance to those tasks. It might be wise – and this is a practical suggestion – to spend the first year of school, Grade 1, creating conditions in the classroom that might permit the child to decide that learning to read and spell are good things to do, rather than telling him so autocratically. Such a procedure might be one of the most useful actions the school could initiate.

Now we turn more directly to the issue of motivation. A motive is a mental representation of a goal. We are going to consider two motives – control of uncertainty, and mastery, because they are important for behavior in school. One of man's primary needs is to control uncertainty. There are three major sources of uncertainty. They are: discrepancy, inconsistency, unpredictability. Let's describe them. In the first class, events in the world that are discrepant from what you know or are discrepant from what is familiar, elicit a tense state of uncertainty. The event can be something in the outside world like a strange animal or the fact that a friend doesn't smile at you, or the uncertainty can be generated by events within your body, an odd feeling in your forearm or a tightening in your chest. If these unusual experiences which we call discrepant cannot be explained, anxiety, apprehension or fear can mount.

The second cause of uncertainty is lack of agreement between two ideas in your head or between an idea and your behavior. For example, a child who believes that his father is wise overhears a relative criticize the father's competence or virtue. Now the child has two beliefs. They are inconsistent and he is uncertain as to which he should believe.

trip; the delights of surf and water are sufficient.

The child is usually forced to learn the academic skills. He feels no need to make up any motive for working at them since he is not given the opportunity to decide that these are, in fact, valuable talents. He does not develop a strong motive for mastery because he has an explanation: teachers and parents make him go to school.

This perception of external pressure has two consequences. It obstructs the development of a motive to master academic tasks and breeds resistance to those tasks. It might be wise – and this is a practical suggestion – to spend the first year of school, Grade 1, creating conditions in the classroom that might permit the child to decide that learning to read and spell are good things to do, rather than telling him so autocratically. Such a procedure might be one of the most useful actions the school could initiate.

Now we turn more directly to the issue of motivation. A motive is a mental representation of a goal. We are going to consider two motives – control of uncertainty, and mastery, because they are important for behavior in school. One of man's primary needs is to control uncertainty. There are three major sources of uncertainty. They are: discrepancy, inconsistency, unpredictability. Let's describe them. In the first class, events in the world that are discrepant from what you know or are discrepant from what is familiar, elicit a tense state of uncertainty. The event can be something in the outside world like a strange animal or the fact that a friend doesn't smile at you, or the uncertainty can be generated by events within your body, an odd feeling in your forearm or a tightening in your chest. If these unusual experiences which we call discrepant cannot be explained, anxiety, apprehension or fear can mount.

The second cause of uncertainty is lack of agreement between two ideas in your head or between an idea and your behavior. For example, a child who believes that his father is wise overhears a relative criticize the father's competence or virtue. Now the child has two beliefs. They are inconsistent and he is uncertain as to which he should believe.

Finally, uncertainty is generated when there is inconsistency between what you believe and what you do. The child feels he is honest. He has just told a lie. He believes he is brave but he has just crossed the street to avoid running into a bully. If the child can resolve any of these uncertainties, no distress or fear will occur. But if he cannot rationalize the inconsistency, he will become anxious.

Unsureness about the future is the final source of uncertainty, especially if that doubt hovers over whether you are going to be punished, or will fail, or be rejected by someone. If you cannot ignore that doubt or reassure yourself, again the stress will mount. Each of these sources of uncertainty leads to a pressing motive to gain control of it, and to reduce it in some way.

Now we get to the behavior of the child. There are many ways to accomplish the goal of resolving uncertainty. Children will have learned that staying close to an adult, or staying close to a parent, will alleviate uncertainty. We often call those children dependent. Others will try to get adult praise for a painting, a good report card, or a clean room. Still others may bully a weaker child or learn to play baseball.

Although behaviors are different on the surface, often the essential sequence begins with some discrepancy that alerts you. If you cannot interpret or cope with the uncertainty in some way, you become upset and are motivated to achieve goals that you believe will control the uncertainty. Human beings, and children too, become afraid when they cannot deal with uncertain situations.

This principle will help you understand the behavior of most teachers and administrators and curriculum supervisors, all of whom have been made uneasy by the very critical attitude of our citizens, boards of education and the press toward the school. The school is getting the brunt of the blame for school failure. This has made all educators uncertain and anxious – anxious because they don't know what to do. This anxiety has led them to become preoccupied with change – any change – as a way of buffering uncertainty. School systems across the nation

adopt readily, perhaps too readily, any new curriculum and a great deal of busy work follows. All this new curriculum keeps teachers, principals and supervisors busy and, therefore, anxiety low.

I am not implying that change in curriculum is of no value. New curriculum can be helpful and, if successful, will increase the school's motivation to try other new ideas.

There are only a few principles that control why a child learns and we must understand those rather than emphasize the difference between reading programs down at the nuts-and-bolts level. Many of our social institutions are conveniently organizing ways to provide all of us with action routines to deal with our uncertainties. Religion, work, schools, even sexuality are complex, ritualized behaviors that bind our attention and turn our minds from preoccupation with daily discrepancies, inconsistencies and complexities that we do not understand and cannot easily interpret.

The implications for the child in school are very important. The most serious moment in any classroom is when the child encounters a problem he does not understand, or one to which he has no rule to apply. During that short period of empty time, which feels to him like an hour, fear and anxiety mount. He needs a response to make or he is going to withdraw from the task. It is critical that in the future we try to provide the child with an available behavior to apply to that material. This principle is usually not heeded.

Every child should always have two tasks to work on. When one is too difficult, he has another to which he can turn, rather than withdraw from the situation.

Our puritanism has not permitted teachers to adopt this practice. We believe conquering frustration builds character. If the child perseveres and masters the hard, he will have learned an important lesson. This is no doubt true for the child who is fortunate enough to have a hypothesis available to help him solve the problem. Many children are not that gifted or lucky. The experience of having no response to take to a problem that is sitting in front of him on his desk while the clock is ticking, arouses his very anxiety and he is apt to withdraw. The teacher must always present a problem difficult enough that it is not solvable at once, but not so difficult that the child is unlikely to have any hypothesis to initiate during the first sixty seconds of work. The best intuitive test of a good curriculum is not how many facts it teaches, but the degree to which it arouses the child to generate ideas.

We now turn to the central force behind a child's desire to master the task in school. As we indicated earlier, the motive for mastery can be used to resolve uncertainty – uncertainty of whether you are right – by teacher, by your parent, or perhaps uncertainty of getting power over some rival. However, the mastery motive also has more primary foundations, derived from three processes: the desire to match your behavior to a standard, the desire to predict and control the environment around you, and the desire to define the self.

The child is continually acquiring ideas about the world – how tall people are, how many feet cows have, how cold snow is. Once he decides on a correct value for any phenomena, he comes to believe in his decisions, arbitrary as they are, and he will try to maintain them. Some of these rules he experiences directly, others he has only heard about. But these rules are referees that tell him how things should be, because to know how things should be is the essential ingredient in the motive for mastery. Watch a four-year-old build a house of blocks. He does so because he has an idea of what a house made of blocks should look like, and blocks are available. Man climbs mountains because he knows how to climb, he has a representation of what it might look like from the top, and there is an available mountain. The essential cognitive motive in the mastery motive, therefore, is a representation of where you are going. Therefore, mastery is probably the most pervasive of man's motives. But there is an additional factor that controls when it will be activated.

It's obviously foolish to expect that every time a child sees some blocks he will stop and

adily, any new cur-
busy work follows.
os teachers, princi-
. therefore, anxiety

ange in curriculum
um can be helpful
e the school's moti-

nciples that control
must understand
the difference be-
n at the nuts-and-
cial institutions are
s to provide all of
deal with our un-
schools, even sex-
behaviors that bind
inds from preoccu-
cies, inconsistencies
not understand and

child in school are
ious moment in any
encounters a prob-
or one to which he
g that short period
him like an hour,
needs a response
withdraw from the
e future we try to
ailable behavior to
principle is usually

s have two tasks to
difficult, he has an-
ther than withdraw

permitted teachers
believe conquering
If the child per-
ard, he will have
This is no doubt
rtunate enough to
to help him solve
are not that gifted
having no response

to take to a problem that is sitting in front of him on his desk while the clock is ticking, arouses his very anxiety and he is apt to withdraw. The teacher must always present a problem difficult enough that it is not solvable at once, but not so difficult that the child is unlikely to have any hypothesis to initiate during the first sixty seconds of work. The best intuitive test of a good curriculum is not how many facts it teaches, but the degree to which it arouses the child to generate ideas.

We now turn to the central force behind a child's desire to master the task in school. As we indicated earlier, the motive for mastery can be used to resolve uncertainty – uncertainty of whether you are right – by teacher, by your parent, or perhaps uncertainty of getting power over some rival. However, the mastery motive also has more primary foundations, derived from three processes: the desire to match your behavior to a standard, the desire to predict and control the environment around you, and the desire to define the self.

The child is continually acquiring ideas about the world – how tall people are, how many feet cows have, how cold snow is. Once he decides on a correct value for any phenomena, he comes to believe in his decisions, arbitrary as they are, and he will try to maintain them. Some of these rules he experiences directly, others he has only heard about. But these rules are referees that tell him how things should be, because to know how things should be is the essential ingredient in the motive for mastery. Watch a four-year-old build a house of blocks. He does so because he has an idea of what a house made of blocks should look like, and blocks are available. Man climbs mountains because he knows how to climb, he has a representation of what it might look like from the top, and there is an available mountain. The essential cognitive motive in the mastery motive, therefore, is a representation of where you are going. Therefore, mastery is probably the most pervasive of man's motives. But there is an additional factor that controls when it will be activated.

It's obviously foolish to expect that every time a child sees some blocks he will stop and build a house. There must be some uncertainty about attaining the goal. If the child is perfectly certain he can build a house, there will be no motivation to build it; and if he's perfectly certain he cannot build one, there will be no motivation to build it. The motive to accomplish anything is generated when the child is a little unsure. Hence, one basis for mastering motive can now be said formally, "You have to possess some idea of an idealized state or experience and you have to be uncertain about being able to match your behavior to that ideal standard."

The second basis for mastery hangs on the desire to predict and control future events. We spend most of our day estimating how tired we'll feel at six o'clock, how heavy the traffic will be. The child is caught in the obsessiveness of predicting what is going to happen at school, how well he will do in the afternoon baseball game. He wants to predict events accurately because it gives him a feeling of control over them.

The child spends much of the first four years in school trying to predict what will happen. Usually about the fifth grade, involvement in school diminishes. Superintendents and teachers over the nation tell me we are doing something wrong in the fifth grade. We are not doing anything wrong in the fifth grade. By the time a child is in the fifth grade he has figured out what the game is all about, and turns to other puzzles.

Each man, if his life is fortunate, makes a series of attempts to predict and control uncertain experiences. When we are done, we move on to another set. The joy is in mastering the challenge. As Leonard Woolf has noted so beautifully in his memoirs, "It's in the journey, not the arrival." The emotion is most intense when you are gaining control, not when you have attained it.

This leads us to the last basis for mastery, the desire for self-definition. Every child, every adult wants to know his unique characteristics. What am I like? This information is going to depend on cultural values, and every child turns to society to discover what he should master. After he has done this, he needs others to find out how well he is doing. Our culture tells a girl she should be beautiful, but how is she to

know how attractive she is unless she compares herself with a wide range of women? Our tests of intellectual ability do not give absolute scores. They tell you how well you compare with everybody else who took the test that day. A person's knowledge of himself is inextricably bound to his knowledge of others. None of us are able to know how smart, wise, beautiful or honest we are without having other people.

A child must use his friends to decide how big, strong, kind, pretty, honest, or athletic he is. Since he wants to know his assets and limitations, he is motivated to master difficult skills to get some feedback on how well he is doing. He must master some of the tasks society says are important – like reading, baseball, cooking and spelling. Otherwise he will not develop an identity. One of the critical factors here is the uniqueness of the skill that is acquired; there is no advantage to having a skill that everybody else possesses. Children must acquire some skill that other children do not have, to develop a super-confidence in some everyday skill. The goal sought is the perception of self as a little bit better than some other child.

The teacher can play a vital role in helping the child become aware of his special area of competence. Teachers should magnify – exaggerate – small differences in the talents of the children in their classrooms. If a child is just a little bit better in art than everybody else in the room, encourage him in order to give him the feeling of distinct competence. The child may view the whole school more positively and invest more motivation.

I suggest that teachers might perform an inventory of each child's profile of talents. There are tests to do this with wisdom and common sense. Do this as early in the school year as possible. Use that information to create work groups that maximize the number of children who have one area of relatively superior skill, no matter how small that initial difference.

If a child feels he is a little bit better in one thing than other children, he will exaggerate that difference and believe he is the best. This builds expectancy of success. Each school must recognize and praise as many areas of competence as possible. Competence is, after all, complete relative, and each child should believe he possesses a special talent.

The motivations for mastery are activate when four conditions are met. 1. The child h to know what he wants to achieve. 2. He has have a goal that achievement will bring hi 3. He has to know how to start the work. 4. H has to have a moderate expectancy of success

As we said earlier, the school tries to chan a child by frightening him, rather than by chan ing these four factors. The teacher should pe suade the child that when faced with a diffic problem there are strategies he can call upon begin work. The teacher must persuade t child that he has more talents than he realiz and, if he uses them, he may be successful.

Children who have had satisfactory relatio with the parents and receive a positive respon from their teacher when they enter school b lieve they are good children. Beginning as ea as three years of age, a child characteristica classifies events and objects on his good-b dimension. It is easy to get a three-year-old decide whether a picture of anything is good bad. The child wants to know how good he and what actions and events are also defined good. He believes that one way to gain t information is through adults.

A child looks to adults and takes their evalu tion of power, competence and popularity. Th the teacher's role as hero or heroine is as criti as the role as technical expert. In the first fi years of school, it is more critical. If the teac is viewed as a hero or heroine, the child will t to maximize similarity to that model and begin show an interest in academic mastery.

Children in all cultures are driven by t motives to resolve uncertainty, gain maste gratify hostility, and experience sensory pleasu Since this is a rather small set of motives, should expect all children across the globe to more similar than they appear to be on t surface. The reason for the paradox is th despite similarity in primary motives, there more divergence in secondary motives. T specific goals of secondary motives are tau by the culture, and these differ with societi

possible. Competence is, after all, completely relative, and each child should believe he possesses a special talent.

The motivations for mastery are activated when four conditions are met. 1. The child has to know what he wants to achieve. 2. He has to have a goal that achievement will bring him. 3. He has to know how to start the work. 4. He has to have a moderate expectancy of success.

As we said earlier, the school tries to change a child by frightening him, rather than by changing these four factors. The teacher should persuade the child that when faced with a difficult problem there are strategies he can call upon to begin work. The teacher must persuade the child that he has more talents than he realizes, and, if he uses them, he may be successful.

Children who have had satisfactory relations with the parents and receive a positive response from their teacher when they enter school believe they are good children. Beginning as early as three years of age, a child characteristically classifies events and objects on his good-bad dimension. It is easy to get a three-year-old to decide whether a picture of anything is good or bad. The child wants to know how good he is, and what actions and events are also defined as good. He believes that one way to gain this information is through adults.

A child looks to adults and takes their evaluation of power, competence and popularity. Thus, the teacher's role as hero or heroine is as critical as the role as technical expert. In the first five years of school, it is more critical. If the teacher is viewed as a hero or heroine, the child will try to maximize similarity to that model and begin to show an interest in academic mastery.

Children in all cultures are driven by the motives to resolve uncertainty, gain mastery, gratify hostility, and experience sensory pleasure. Since this is a rather small set of motives, we should expect all children across the globe to be more similar than they appear to be on the surface. The reason for the paradox is that despite similarity in primary motives, there is more divergence in secondary motives. The specific goals of secondary motives are taught by the culture, and these differ with societies. An American ten-year-old, middle-class child in Evanston, Illinois, tries to get good grades in order to reduce uncertainty regarding his relationship to his parents. The ten-year-old Indian child in rural Guatemala, faced with the same uncertainty, tries to be a better coffee cutter.

If the teacher knows the primary goals each child is seeking, then she can arrange the classroom so that academic excellence is seen as a means of gratifying these goals. Each child is motivated for something. The teacher must find it and graft the motive for academic mastery to it. If the graft is successful, the child may eventually fall in love with learning. Then, and only then, will we be able to measure his level of accomplishment – not by tests, I.Q. or achievement, but by heeding Grumwalt's suggestion, "To judge how high a child's talent will reach, do not attain much to his greater and smaller facility for learning technical notions. Watch to see whether his eyes are occasionally clouded with tears of enthusiasm for the work."

Jerome Kagan
and G. R. Bowers

Dr. Martin Essex
and Senator Walter Mondale

Jerome Kagan
and G. R. Bowers

Dr. Martin Essex
and Senator Walter Mondale

CHRISTINE F. BRANCHE

Directing Supervisor
Early Childhood Education
Cleveland Public Schools
Cleveland, Ohio

Parents as Partners

Christine F. Branche

In many places today, the involvement of parents in the educational process is held synonymous with the ominous uncertainties of "community control." There is certainly no rationale for this approach other than insecurity on the part of the educational community. Traditionally parents have been involved in a variety of ways in programs for *young* children. Those of us in early childhood education should consider this basic. The nursery school movement has always held parent participation as a critical factor in providing for the needs of the child. In the old-fashioned school, the parents were partners . . . but in the sense of being in league with the teacher and against the child! Over the years the generally accepted approach to parents has been a periodic report on the child's progress and, perhaps, selected courses in Parent Education for parents. This usually took the form of a lecture scheduled because staff decided it was something parents ought to know, rarely at the request of the parents. Otherwise, parents were contacted only when Johnny was in trouble.

The War on Poverty, which burst onto the scene in 1965, was the first mass programming with a mandate for "maximum feasible participation." Project Head Start, Project Follow Through, and the Parent Child Centers Program, all involve (or should involve) parents in every phase of the program . . . as paraprofessionals, volunteers, participants in projects *they* design and as members of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) which governs program direction. Last year the Commissioner of Education sent a memorandum to the State Departments of Education encouraging the use of the same approach in Title I Programs.

Why Participation?

There are strong psychological factors that make parents of young children much more "available" to the staff. Regardless of socio-economic level, race, circumstance or location, all parents of young children cherish the hope that "things will be better" for this child. They are concerned and protective. It is the responsibility of the school to take advantage of this mind-set by forming a workable partnership with parents, between home and school, to maximize the effect of education on the whole child. Parents loan to us their most precious possessions and have the *right* to inclusion as participants in their educational program. This is not a privilege . . . it is where they belong. Teachers and administrators have unions. There are no unions for children save their parents who were indeed their first teachers, and perhaps the most important designers of their destiny. Think of the powerful influence that could be exerted by a combination of educators and parents as advocates for a better world for children. Parents provide for the school vital insight into the other pieces of the child. We have him such a small percent of his day. Parents and the family can be the most relevant reinforcers of what is being offered by the educational establishment. This comes as a surprise to many educators who assume their role as a totality in educating the child. It comes as a *shock* to parents when they discover themselves to be master teachers and their home to be a powerful environmental learning laboratory. The family, regardless of life-style and design, is our most unmined resource for the child . . . rich or poor. They do the most effective job of interpreting what is going on inside that schoolhouse to their peers and to the neighborhood . . . if they know and are a part of it. In league with the community they alone can make the *total* environment more responsive to the needs of their children. This total environment provides a major portion of what a child learns. Parents ar
available. (Consi
creative communi
"grapevine"?) Th
the school is an u
simply want to b
the life of their c
mand. As one m
stand being overr
overlooked!" The
the team. The
new experiences
broaden the bas
curriculum. Par
if they are to
standing. The p
warding for all

Staff-Readines

The primary
participation is t
teachers, but ev
of the school m
word, acceptanc
throughout the
pitality. This is
ized by staff. T
fore, is staff ori
cleaning women
classroom staff
must be an und
be made by par
implementation
must learn to
worth and digni
prejudging life-s
— we work in c
be a missionar
smacks of con
. . . no matter
ticularly low in
in radar to det
"phony" from t
much pride to
human dignity
demonstrate en
for successful
adults alike.

Last year the Commissioner of Education sent a memorandum to the State Departments of Education encouraging the use of the same approach in Title I Programs.

Why Participation?

There are strong psychological factors that make parents of young children much more "available" to the staff. Regardless of socio-economic level, race, circumstance or location, all parents of young children cherish the hope that "things will be better" for this child. They are concerned and protective. It is the responsibility of the school to take advantage of this mind-set by forming a workable partnership with parents, between home and school, to maximize the effect of education on the whole child. Parents loan to us their most precious possessions and have the *right* to inclusion as participants in their educational program. This is not a privilege . . . it is where they belong. Teachers and administrators have unions. There are no unions for children save their parents who were indeed their first teachers, and perhaps the most important designers of their destiny. Think of the powerful influence that could be exerted by a combination of educators and parents as advocates for a better world for children. Parents provide for the school vital insight into the other pieces of the child. We have him such a small percent of his day. Parents and the family can be the most relevant reinforcers of what is being offered by the educational establishment. This comes as a surprise to many educators who assume their role as a totality in educating the child. It comes as a *shock* to parents when they discover themselves to be master teachers and their home to be a powerful environmental learning laboratory. The family, regardless of life-style and design, is our most unmined resource for the child . . . rich or poor. They do the most effective job of interpreting what is going on inside that schoolhouse to their peers and to the neighborhood . . . if they know and are a part of it. In league with the community they alone can make the *total* environment more responsive to the needs of their children. This total environment provides a major portion of what a child learns. Parents are the most effective press corps available. (Consider: Have we found a more creative communication tool than the community "grapevine"?) The specter of parents taking over the school is an unfortunate exaggeration. They simply want to be a part of what is going on in the life of their child; to understand, not to command. As one mother put it, "We can understand being overruled. We just don't like being overlooked!" They want to be and should be on the team. The compensatory programs stress new experiences, materials, and approaches to broaden the base upon which the school builds curriculum. Parents must share in this process if they are to provide continuity and understanding. The process can be tremendously rewarding for all concerned.

Staff-Readiness

The primary ingredient for meaningful parent participation is the attitude of the staff. Not just teachers, but everyone who is in any way a part of the school must exhibit, by deed as well as word, acceptance and respect. There must be, throughout the building, a climate of warm hospitality. This is not possible if it is not internalized by staff. The first order of business, therefore, is staff orientation for everyone from the cleaning women and custodian to the clerk, the classroom staff and the administration. There must be an understanding of the contribution to be made by parents as a vital factor in successful implementation of educational programs. Staff must learn to respect the individual family's worth and dignity, recognizing strengths and not prejudging life-styles. We do not sit in judgment — we work in cooperation. This in no way is to be a missionary benevolence which invariably smacks of condescending professional bigotry . . . no matter how well intended. Parents, particularly low income parents, seem to have built-in radar to detect hypocrisy. They can spot a "phony" from the first encounter and have too much pride to remain in a situation where their human dignity may be violated. Staff should demonstrate empathy and a positive expectancy for successful interaction with children and adults alike. We must take care to be honest

with parents and not succumb to the temptation of "using" them to meet *our* needs.

To insure the maintenance of this positive approach, on-going and evaluative inservice training of staff is necessary. The issue is critical enough to warrant the time required. Emphasis must be placed on the importance of the impression created the *first* time a school comes in contact with the family. This should be at the beginning of the child's entrance into a program or a class. Staff must recognize that parent attitudes about school are composites of their own past experiences, which were often negative and painful. It is urgent that each staff member recognize that he, likewise, is a composite of his own preconceived ideas of these families. This indicates a need for staff to become knowledgeable about differing life-styles, flexible family groupings, the isolation, loneliness and alienation that is spawned by poverty, as well as the negative self-image held by the poor which is reinforced daily by the bountiful offerings of TV . . . in living color. The poor are so maligned by our terminology . . . "disadvantaged." We have used this cliche so much that we are beginning to believe it. The poor are disadvantaged only because of lack of funds. They do have "experiences;" they do have language; they do have concepts! They have tremendous strengths that must be recognized, i.e., creativity, adaptability, and amazing mental health. Acceptance of these concepts will make the infusion of parent participation throughout the program a goal that is within reach of every school.

The Mechanics of Involvement

In the Cleveland Public Schools we have had tremendous success in our Title I and ADCU Programs in working with parents as partners. The parents of the children we serve do have usable skills! On the staff they are classroom educational aides, community and home visitors, medical and dental aides, bilingual aides, and several have through a "career ladder" approach become classroom teachers! Last year a group of mothers was trained to administer tests, observation scales and behavior inventories to youngsters in several programs. These have become "models" for a program fielded by Stanford Research Institute. Thousands of parents, and indeed family members, serve as volunteers. Some come to learn what is going on in the classroom. Many attend training sessions to develop specialized skills needed in the classroom. This includes mothers, fathers, grandmothers, baby sitters, teen-age sibling dropouts, whoever is close to this child. The men and boys provide a rare male image ingredient so desperately needed in our classrooms for young children. They assist in speech improvement, reading, and physical development as well as block building and carpentry. Members of the family unit accompany classes on trips. Particular talents are recognized and utilized bringing us someone to do folk songs, make doll clothes, and painting aprons and even repair toys. There are never enough hands available to truly individualize instruction.

Educators today need to recognize the need for a completely new approach to "parent education." It must take on added depth and breadth. In our classrooms we must provide for frequent observations for parents to see the child in the act of learning, the progression of curriculum, the variety of devices that are not just games. Parents participate in activities *with* their children. They will recognize the adage as truth that "play is a child's work." Only thus will parents see the relevance of school to home, to community and to culture. In return they can indicate how we can more fully incorporate and build upon what is a part of the child's other environment. In Cleveland, we work with parents to produce a regular parent newsletter, "The Bridge," which serves to communicate this information. It includes special interest articles and photographs of parents and children "doing their thing." A toy library is maintained to allow specific learning materials to be taken home by parents to reinforce curriculum. Booklets and single sheet bulletins are prepared to provide ideas for implementation of concepts and to share information on child growth and development (bilingual where necessary) at home. Early Childhood Education classrooms have a parent bulletin board where pertinent information is

become "models" for a program fielded by Stanford Research Institute. Thousands of parents, and indeed family members, serve as volunteers. Some come to learn what is going on in the classroom. Many attend training sessions to develop specialized skills needed in the classroom. This includes mothers, fathers, grandmothers, baby sitters, teen-age sibling dropouts, whoever is close to this child. The men and boys provide a rare male image ingredient so desperately needed in our classrooms for young children. They assist in speech improvement, reading, and physical development as well as block building and carpentry. Members of the family unit accompany classes on trips. Particular talents are recognized and utilized bringing us someone to do folk songs, make doll clothes, and painting aprons and even repair toys. There are never enough hands available to truly individualize instruction.

Educators today need to recognize the need for a completely new approach to "parent education." It must take on added depth and breadth. In our classrooms we must provide for frequent observations for parents to see the child in the act of learning, the progression of curriculum, the variety of devices that are not just games. Parents participate in activities *with* their children. They will recognize the adage as truth that "play is a child's work." Only thus will parents see the relevance of school to home, to community and to culture. In return they can indicate how we can more fully incorporate and build upon what is a part of the child's other environment. In Cleveland, we work with parents to produce a regular parent newsletter, "The Bridge," which serves to communicate this information. It includes special interest articles and photographs of parents and children "doing their thing." A toy library is maintained to allow specific learning materials to be taken home by parents to reinforce curriculum. Booklets and single sheet bulletins are prepared to provide ideas for implementation of concepts and to share information on child growth and development (bilingual where necessary) at home. Early Childhood Education classrooms have a parent bulletin board where pertinent information is posted for parents not only on curriculum but also on relevant matters such as nutrition, housing, health, TV programs, community information, job opportunities, adult education courses, etc. All of these "devices" must reflect positive attitudes. They should be neat, attractive, clever, and *carefully* done. Where space is available, a parent room could be provided, complete with a lending library of books and magazines as well as toys. Community agencies such as the utilities, department stores, local newspapers and television stations can be of great assistance in providing free materials.

This brings us to special projects and programs for parent groups. The critical factor here is that "for" be replaced by "with" parents. The secret to success here is a staff that has developed the fast disappearing art of "purposeful listening." Parents give us many cues to their concerns and interests if we are alert, observing and concerned enough to hear them. All parents will not be keenly interested in pursuing the same things. Economic level does not standardize human interests. What begins as a basic orientation for parents to the program that their child is to enter can gradually become a variety of interest groups to meet many expressed needs. The classroom and schoolhouse need not be the only site for group activities. They will request programs for everything from canvassing the community (or city) to determine where and how to get needed services for their children, to arts and crafts classes for self-development. Staff serves as a resource to parents to bring together the concerns of the school with the feelings and perceptions of the family . . . develop a consensus and proceed together to grow in strength as lobbyists for the child. This will have residual effects on the program of the Parent Teacher Association, which generally is delighted to absorb this fresh, vital thrust as a part of its own.

One of the most meaningful groups for the Title I Early Childhood Education Programs in Cleveland has been the PAC and its feeder committees. Classroom parents select, and eventually elect, two representatives to the city-wide group which meets regularly. They have

helped determine program direction, inter-agency cooperation, curricular relevance, and grievance procedures. It was this group that in 1967 recommended serving breakfast to pre-schoolers and launched the first breakfast program in the nation. It has grown to a daily service to 45,000 youngsters, improving not only the health and nutrition, but also the attendance of elementary school children. The PAC reviews proposals, investigates program approaches, reviews evaluations and generally becomes far more knowledgeable than most PTA groups about what makes their schools tick. Parents thus have what might be called "conceit in constructive proportions." The representatives report back to their school groups both formally and informally. They are included on the school board mailing list to receive pertinent school information. Their elected executive committee is included on a variety of system-wide projects. They have become most vocal advocates of quality education, providing a magnificent public information and interpretation outlet to the grass roots. No amount of money can purchase that kind of meaningful public relations. It must be earned by partnership!

Prove It?

This is not remote from the education of the young child. Not at all! The broader the base of participation by the family, the better the interaction between school and home. According to the Kirshner Report, there is a direct long term effect between parent involvement in and the child's conception of his place in the stream of schooling. Where there has been meaningful parent involvement, there has been needed trends toward institutional changes in the community and the educational systems. Longitudinal studies being conducted locally by our bureau of educational research show significant influences. Pupil attendance is up. Siblings entering pre-kindergarten programs show rapid and remarkable adjustment to the school setting and program. Third graders who have had this kind of personal support are showing continuing high interest and positive attitudes toward school. Many more parents are involved throughout the school as volunteers. Adult attendance at total school functions is rising. Parents just passed a trio of school tax levy-bond issues by a whopping majority while many suburban systems around us went down to defeat in this year of the taxpayers revolt. Hundreds of teachers are now in partnership with parents on a continuing basis, which has spread from the central city to the outskirts of the system. Kindergarten observation days produce wall-to-wall parents. Readiness test results have soared. Partnerships are working that encompass the child, his family and his school.

In the complex society in which we live, education must be creative enough and secure enough to fashion new coalitions to maximize each child's learning potential and provide humaneness in the human condition. This is the promise we make to our consumers. Can we either morally or legally justify the exclusion of the concerns of these consumers who are providing us with the raw material, their children? Education has become far too multifaceted and expensive for us to implement in a customized, dynamic fashion without the assistance of our consumers, the parents. Title I gives us the rare financial gift that allows for creative experimentation and staffing. We cannot educate the whole child without his parent nor can the parent do so alone. It must be done in partnership, not just in one area, but an involvement in the total life of the school. It can be the most exciting, productive, fruitful and mutually educational experience of our time . . . if we *believe*. Parents want the best for their children . . . and so do we. Together it is possible for us to fashion a total adventure into learning that will sustain this child far into the future. We cannot afford to fail. There is so little time.

LELAND B. JACOBS

Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York

When the Young Child Finds Importance in Reading

Leland B. Jacobs

Almost every young child at school knows that he is expected to learn to read. He knows that his parents expect the school to take on this task. He knows that teachers expect him to learn how to read. And he hears about school and reading from older children. Indeed, it must seem to the young child that all the world has its eyes on him with regard to his induction into the mysteries of the reading act. In our country, learning to read is one of the major tasks of early childhood set by the society, via the school experience, which is mandated for all of the people.

Not only does the young child know he is expected to learn to read. So, too, do teachers of young children know that they are expected to teach the young to read. In fact, in the first grade, much of the judgment of a teacher's success as a professional is based on the ability to induct the child into the reading process. Whatever other teaching competences, the teacher has, they do not – in most situations – compare in importance with the ability to get children started satisfactorily in reading print.

Too, the amount of energy and money spent in doing research about beginning reading and in preparing materials for teaching young children to read is tremendous, and every year still more is expended. Few other curriculum areas come close to the outlay of man hours and dollars that go into beginning reading, so important is it considered to be by everyone in any way connected with the formal education of young children. It is as if the whole country waited upon the achievement of each year's crop of school beginners in this one area of the school experience above all other educational attainments that the school might reach.

And so, year after year, attention to the induction of the child into reading goes on – and, hopefully, forward. As we again consider this matter, let me start with what seem to me to be some major undergirdings of teaching reading to the young:

. . . there never have been, and there are not now, any set systems, programs, procedures, or panaceas, that can guarantee every child *will* learn to read.

. . . Reading materials or technological devices cannot teach. They may be instructive or provide practice, but only human beings teach. And all the persons in classrooms who bear the name are not teachers. Some are schoolkeepers (formers) who prescribe, drill, grade, and keep to an orderly progression of lesson steps and requirements and in a uniform set of plans, procedures, and materials. Some are instructors (informers) who impart, question, coach, advise, in logical maneuverings that are intended to induct the child into knowing about how to read. And some are real teachers (informers), who surround children with opportunities to learn; intellectualize with them with what they know so that they can reach out to know more; guide them from where they seem to be in accomplishments toward increasingly more discriminative, precise competences.

. . . To teach beginning reading successfully, one does need to know major research findings that have been enunciated. But he also needs to have developed his teaching style for incorporating what is known about beginning reading into a form that makes it possible for his students to be-

dollars that go into beginning reading, so important is it considered to be by everyone in any way connected with the formal education of young children. It is as if the whole country waited upon the achievement of each year's crop of school beginners in this one area of the school experience above all other educational attainments that the school might reach.

And so, year after year, attention to the induction of the child into reading goes on — and, hopefully, forward. As we again consider this matter, let me start with what seem to me to be some major undergirdings of teaching reading to the young:

. . . there never have been, and there are not now, any set systems, programs, procedures, or panaceas, that can guarantee every child *will* learn to read.

. . . Reading materials or technological devices cannot teach. They may be instructive or provide practice, but only human beings teach. And all the persons in classrooms who bear the name are not teachers. Some are schoolkeepers (formers) who prescribe, drill, grade, and keep to an orderly progression of lesson steps and requirements and in a uniform set of plans, procedures, and materials. Some are instructors (informers) who impart, question, coach, advise, in logical maneuverings that are intended to induct the child into knowing about how to read. And some are real teachers (informers), who surround children with opportunities to learn; intellectualize with them with what they know so that they can reach out to know more; guide them from where they seem to be in accomplishments toward increasingly more discriminative, precise competences.

. . . To teach beginning reading successfully, one does need to know major research findings that have been enunciated. But he also needs to have developed his teaching style for incorporating what is known about beginning reading into a form that makes it possible for his students to become readers, because he has made it important and meaningful to them.

. . . To teach beginning reading well, the teacher also needs to be a reader — not only a person who can read but also one who turns to reading for its enjoyment, a person who so takes pleasure in the reading act that his enthusiasm is well communicated to the children whom he teaches.

. . . An important part of inducting the child into the reading of print is reading to him — reading stories, or mood pieces in prose fiction, and poetry so that his own first sorties into unlocking print have the underpinnings of having heard print well read; knowing the wonderful recompenses there are for being able to read on one's own; and sensing the feel of form that is the essence of good composition.

Beyond such undergirdings, let us consider what the teacher can do to make reading possible in a young child from three different stances.

The first stance gives consideration to what the teacher must do to establish the schooling ground from which learning to read becomes a possibility for a child. For until an appropriate schooling ground is established, the child remains outside being truly teachable. The child and the teacher each brings his "inner subjectivity" and "life space" to the classroom. If each is to use to full advantage what each brings of himself that is essential to a meeting with regard to school content, each must be respected by the other. The "meeting place" (in this instance, reading) must be mutually made a good place to be.

In other words, the teacher must recognize that, in teaching a young child to read, the first requirement is respect for the person to be taught:

. . . Respect for the child's being. The true teacher knows that the child has the right to come to school who he is (in sex, in age, in health, in socio-economic status, in his ordinal position, in the family, in his religion, his family structure, his community and sub-cultural backgrounds, and

the like) as he is (his values, beliefs, drives, aspirations, self concept, et cetera). Or, one might say, the teacher respects the dignity of the child's being who he is, as he is. For the child cannot, without reservations, present himself to be taught until he senses genuine acceptance of his being.

Moreover, the teacher knows the child comes alone – unique, not like any other human being, though of mankind's own. He is not a bundle of individual differences, however. Instead, he is a "whole child" whose totality is not disparate elements or characteristics; this is what must be taken into account in establishing the schooling ground with him, so that he will find sure residence in the tasks of the school's domain:

> . . . Respect for his need for recognition. The true teacher knows that the child needs to be more than a number, a part of a group, an "it." He must not only be recognized as a doer, a knower, a generalist, and a specialist. The true teacher further establishes his schooling ground for learning to read by (in as many ways as possible) letting the child know that he is a person and a personality; that he is a "common man," as are all the other children and an "expert" unlike in talents and interests from others in the same classroom setting.

Nor does the teacher – by word or action – presume to *know* the child. Built into the respect for recognition, along with the fact of his being, is the expectation that one holds tentatively the expressions of his various behaviors since he is a dynamic being, and will, in the education enterprise, develop and change, hopefully for the better.

In general, then, the first stance may not seem to be in the mainstream of getting the young child to read. But without the establishment of such a schooling ground, where a child is comfortable with himself at school, he cannot truly let his energies flow freely into the schooling tasks with which he is confronted. He cannot truly give himself openly, without resistances, until he feels that he is important, secure, and can safely sometimes succeed and sometimes fail openly in the eyes of the person who would teach him.

The second stance deals with the teacher's meaning of reading. If reading is viewed as a school subject, or as a kind of content, it is likely not to be of major consequence to the child, since reading is, in such terms, inert and static, something that is an "it," a cold, impersonal "whatchamacallit." On the other hand, if the teacher views reading (as it would seem the true teacher does) as having little importance except as an operative in and by a child, then it becomes a dynamic, vital instrumentality for nurturing his curiosities, his concerns, his commitments, his wonderings, his questings for knowing, his seekings for fulfillment. Simultaneously, then, he is learning to control process, skills, and abilities that release him to larger areas of independence, of self-sustaining, self-enhancing margins of freedom.

In such a light, certain matters with regard to the meaning of reading will need to be reconsidered:

> . . . Learning to decode is important, but only in relation to other considerations. For instance, being absolutely precise in decoding a sentence or a word is not worth the price if a child, by being somewhat inprecise, concludes he can't learn to read, is the most inferior reader in the class, is a stumbling bumbling human being. Or, precise decoding is not worth the price if a child concludes, for more than a short initial period, that decoding is an end in and of itself, or that decoding *is* reading.

Reading is, simultaneously, the bringing of meaning to and the getting of meaning from a system of signs, signals, and symbols. Reading is extracting from something that "stands for" something that can be experienced firsthand, elements of what has been experienced or has made sense to a writer. Reading, in English, is more sentence oriented than isolated word oriented, and considerably more so than syllable or letter-sound oriented. Written language is one of man's inventions for capturing, in some sense, the primary language, which is oral.

can safely sometimes succeed and sometimes fail openly in the eyes of the person who would teach him.

The second stance deals with the teacher's meaning of reading. If reading is viewed as a school subject, or as a kind of content, it is likely not to be of major consequence to the child, since reading is, in such terms, inert and static, something that is an "it," a cold, impersonal "whatchamacallit." On the other hand, if the teacher views reading (as it would seem the true teacher does) as having little importance except as an operative in and by a child, then it becomes a dynamic, vital instrumentality for nurturing his curiosities, his concerns, his commitments, his wonderings, his questings for knowing, his seekings for fulfillment. Simultaneously, then, he is learning to control process, skills, and abilities that release him to larger areas of independence, of self-sustaining, self-enhancing margins of freedom.

In such a light, certain matters with regard to the meaning of reading will need to be reconsidered:

> . . . Learning to decode is important, but only in relation to other considerations. For instance, being absolutely precise in decoding a sentence or a word is not worth the price if a child, by being somewhat inprecise, concludes he can't learn to read, is the most inferior reader in the class, is a stumbling bumbling human being. Or, precise decoding is not worth the price if a child concludes, for more than a short initial period, that decoding is an end in and of itself, or that decoding *is* reading.

Reading is, simultaneously, the bringing of meaning to and the getting of meaning from a system of signs, signals, and symbols. Reading is extracting from something that "stands for" something that can be experienced firsthand, elements of what has been experienced or has made sense to a writer. Reading, in English, is more sentence oriented than isolated word oriented, and considerably more so than syllable or letter-sound oriented. Written language is one of man's inventions for capturing, in some sense, the primary language, which is oral. Decoding, thereby, is only a vestibule to reading. Children need to view it as such, and need to be able to use a variety of keys to the decoding vestibule – look and say, some phonics, or context clues.

> . . . "Reading readiness," as currently practiced in many situations with beginning readers, is neither particularly useful nor effectual. In many "reading readiness" programs and materials, the implication is that the young child knows nothing about reading, when, in fact, he has been reading for a rather long time before he comes to school. He can walk around the block and read the architectural design of stores, churches, schools, et cetera. He can walk into a garden and by just seeing the tops of vegetables read carrots, beets, potatoes. He can read pictures and photographs. What he probably can't read is print. By helping the child to know that he has a lot going for him in reading when he comes to school, and proving it to him, the teacher demonstrates to him that he has been reading – but not print, which the teacher will now help him to do. In such a situation, he has already gotten ready. He is "readied." He now extends in a more refined form what he has been doing somewhat already in grosser ways.

. . . In beginning reading, too much attention to slight errors can impede rather than accelerate progress. If a child reads "kitty," but the text says "kitten" that is a slight error, and not one of meaning. In initial stages of reading, is it so important to make an issue of the "y" and "en"? If the child is in the right territory, might it not be more important to let the slight error pass, in order to keep the feeling of being able to read, and of making progress as a reader uppermost? While the teacher wants the child to be a careful, precise reader ultimately, too many interruptions in the early stages of reading, too many small discriminations to get under control before one is in control of larger processes can be detrimental to the child in wanting

to learn more about how to read or to tackling increasingly difficult reading matter. More than anything else, in beginning reading, the teacher must keep children wanting to try to read and to feel, "I can learn to read more and more and more."

From a third stance, in the beginning stages of reading, the child needs to come in contact with reading matter that is discursive and non-discursive in intent and meaning.

Discourse deals with facts, data, materiality, information. It is thought about thought. It is, in its development and form and intent, logical and linear. And the writer expects his work is to be read as so logically organized. It can be taken, part by part, and reasoned about in terms of being a part of a larger body of information or of some collection of facts that hold together reasonably. The test of discourse is: Is this verifiable?

Non-discourse is primarily a story or poem. It is thought about feeling. In development, form and intent, story and poem are metaphorical and symbolic rather than logical and linear. Their reasonableness is not so much based on reasoning as on the author's ability to get the reader to suspend his own actualities and enter into the created reality that the writer has composed, and accept the proposed circumstances, happenings, and the like as having authenticity. The test of non-discourse, then, is: Is it believable, whether or not one can verify it either from firsthand experience or from consultation of other sources?

For the beginning reader, it is important, from this stance, that:

. . . He get experiences with both discourse and non-discourse. It is, further, important that he not be led to believe that exercise materials used for beginning reading be construed to be "story." As essential as such exercise material may be, it should be labeled or named for what it is. To call this material "story" is not only confusing to the young child; it is, literarily, miseducative.

. . . Discussion of discourse and non-discourse calls for quite different teaching strategies. For factual, informational, discursive materials, questioning on the part of the teacher should be precisely pointed to the actualities and materiality of the selections read. In other words, one attempts to establish the right answer; but – and it is too often the case – the same kinds of questions are too frequently asked of non-discourse. If this is the case, the essential meaning of the story or poem is lost, since the sources of the import and impact of non-discourse transcends the factual or informational. Discussion of non-discourse calls for interpretation and criticism of what has been read. The major thrust in the discussion of non-discourse is on the essence of the life experience presented in the poem or story, symbolically put forth as an exploration and illumination of man's hopes, desires, searchings, deed, achievements, or his attempts to make life good. Rather than "*the* right" answer, in reacting to non-discourse, the reader should be led to discuss the discovery of what *for him* in this selection is the acceptable answer.

. . . From contacts with both discourse and non-discourse, at an early age, the child is well taught in beginning reading when print stimulates his sense of wonder; when, in his responses to what he has read, he responds out of his real self to what he has decoded; when he feels enriched intellectually and aesthetically by what he has read.

To confine beginning reading to a series of experiences that unlock print is to miss the joy of teaching a young child to become a real reader rather than a mere tinker with little black marks. To expand his vision of the explorations that are his to know through reading is, to my way of thinking, the most important, the primary responsibility, within which all other considerations (such as mastering skills, developing abilities, learning study skills, and the like) must find their bearings.

When the young child finds importance in

reading, it i
subject. It
personal po
ing and in
stirred in h
it says, and
richer life.

how to read or to
difficult reading mat-
hing else, in begin-
cher must keep chil-
o read and to feel,
more and more and

the beginning stages
to come in contact
discursive and non-
caning.

ts, data, materiality,
about thought. It is,
n and intent, logical
expects his work is
rganized. It can be
soned about in terms
body of information
ts that hold together
liscourse is: Is this

ily a story or poem.
n development, form
are metaphorical and
al and linear. Their
h based on reasoning
get the reader to sus-
and enter into the
er has composed, and
nstances, happenings,
henticity. The test of
t believable, whether
either from firsthand
ation of other sources?
der, it is important,

with both discourse
It is, further, impor-
led to believe that
used for beginning
ed to be "story." As
rcise material may be,
or named for what it
rial "story" is not only
ung child; it is, liter-

rse and non-discourse

calls for quite different teaching strategies. For factual, informational, discursive materials, questioning on the part of the teacher should be precisely pointed to the actualities and materiality of the selections read. In other words, one attempts to establish the right answer; but – and it is too often the case – the same kinds of questions are too frequently asked of non-discourse. If this is the case, the essential meaning of the story or poem is lost, since the sources of the import and impact of non-discourse transcends the factual or informational. Discussion of non-discourse calls for interpretation and criticism of what has been read. The major thrust in the discussion of non-discourse is on the essence of the life experience presented in the poem or story, symbolically put forth as an exploration and illumination of man's hopes, desires, searchings, deed, achievements, or his attempts to make life good. Rather than "*the* right" answer, in reacting to non-discourse, the reader should be led to discuss the discovery of what *for him* in this selection is the acceptable answer.

. . . From contacts with both discourse and non-discourse, at an early age, the child is well taught in beginning reading when print stimulates his sense of wonder; when, in his responses to what he has read, he responds out of his real self to what he has decoded; when he feels enriched intellectually and aesthetically by what he has read.

To confine beginning reading to a series of experiences that unlock print is to miss the joy of teaching a young child to become a real reader rather than a mere tinker with little black marks. To expand his vision of the explorations that are his to know through reading is, to my way of thinking, the most important, the primary responsibility, within which all other considerations (such as mastering skills, developing abilities, learning study skills, and the like) must find their bearings.

When the young child finds importance in reading, it is not because it is a required school subject. It is because the child has felt the personal power that reading gives him in knowing and in doing. It is because there has been stirred in him an excitement for print and what it says, and the means for making for himself a richer life.

LILIAN G. KATZ

Director ERIC/ECE
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Four Questions on Early Childhood Education

Lilian G. Katz

By way of introduction I would like to put current developments in the field of early childhood education into the following context. During the 1950's the main focus of educational effort in the United States was the improvement of the *quality* of education. After the launching of sputnik we had the National Defense Education Act, and began to introduce new math and science curricula into schools, and began the instruction of foreign languages even in the elementary grades.

In the 1960's we turned our attention to a far more serious problem, *equality* of education, and we are a long way from a solution to that problem. The major thrust in education for the 1970's appears to be *economy*, and it may take us until the 1980's to realize that *economy* will undo the very slender gains we have just begun to make in both the *quality* and *equality* of education.

Back to the 1960's, when early childhood education got its big push, we had some favorite explanations or hypotheses concerning the problems of disadvantaged children. I refer to them as the three "d's"! The first hypothesis was that the children of the poor – of all ethnic groups – were *deprived*. What we did then was to develop all sorts of early childhood programs designed to provide enrichment. We then had the second "d," the *deficiency* hypothesis, which explained the problems of poor children in terms of specific skill and knowledge deficiencies for which instructional programs were developed.

By now we are well into the period of the third "d"; that children of the poor are not so much deprived or deficient as they are *different*. They have strengths of their own which are to be respected and maximized, and programs are designed to build on these strengths and to expose the child to the mainstream of America. It is my impression that all three hypotheses are valid to some extent. With these brief remarks as background, I would like to raise four questions.

The first important question is: What kinds of goals make sense? I would like to suggest a distinction between *academic* goals and *intellectual* goals. Academic goals have to do with achievement, getting good scores on tests, learning the role of pupil. At the university level they mean completing the right number of units, fulfilling the requirements, and obtaining degrees. Academic goals have no enduring value; they are tied to the institutional aspects of education. On the other hand, intellectual goals have to do with being an inquirer, or experimenter, an explorer, a question-asker. The goal is to acquire the role of learner rather than pupil.

There are differences in motivational emphases associated with these goals also. Programs which have academic goals are concerned with motivation to achieve; programs with intellectual goals focus on motivation to learn.

This distinction between the academic and intellectual goals may seem like a fine distinction, but it represents a major schism in the field of early education. Most of us, upon serious thought, realize that we are basically committed to intellectual goals; but we allow the academic goals to become ends in themselves – often in ways that stultify intellectual growth.

Another aspect of the problem of goals I want to touch on is that educators do not really make decisions about goals. In a country like ours, where education is a public responsibility, the goals of education are decided upon by "society," at least, the most vocal segments of that society. In order for educators to have a voice in setting

goals for the
a great deal
in us.

Yet anoth
is that early
sold. We hav
experiences t
development.
are a specia
simply canno
child someth
that will last
we know tha
diet for the
this prenatal
can't get rick
He needs o
growth—all t
ment. There
ences in the
them from a
of this positi
at the age of
well, you ca
off to a bet
irreversible a
really predic
what a child
environment
ment, stays t
education is
important th

Returnin
the most con
child's envi
have a way
away at the
long-range
seems to me
the confide
parent has
of his child
grade readi
we must sh
that their c
coping with
disheartenin
ness and fa

the problems of poor children in terms of specific skill and knowledge deficiencies for which instructional programs were developed.

By now we are well into the period of the third "d"; that children of the poor are not so much deprived or deficient as they are *different*. They have strengths of their own which are to be respected and maximized, and programs are designed to build on these strengths and to expose the child to the mainstream of America. It is my impression that all three hypotheses are valid to some extent. With these brief remarks as background, I would like to raise four questions.

The first important question is: What kinds of goals make sense? I would like to suggest a distinction between *academic* goals and *intellectual* goals. Academic goals have to do with achievement, getting good scores on tests, learning the role of pupil. At the university level they mean completing the right number of units, fulfilling the requirements, and obtaining degrees. Academic goals have no enduring value; they are tied to the institutional aspects of education. On the other hand, intellectual goals have to do with being an inquirer, or experimenter, an explorer, a question-asker. The goal is to acquire the role of learner rather than pupil.

There are differences in motivational emphases associated with these goals also. Programs which have academic goals are concerned with motivation to achieve; programs with intellectual goals focus on motivation to learn.

This distinction between the academic and intellectual goals may seem like a fine distinction, but it represents a major schism in the field of early education. Most of us, upon serious thought, realize that we are basically committed to intellectual goals; but we allow the academic goals to become ends in themselves – often in ways that stultify intellectual growth.

Another aspect of the problem of goals I want to touch on is that educators do not really make decisions about goals. In a country like ours, where education is a public responsibility, the goals of education are decided upon by "society," at least, the most vocal segments of that society. In order for educators to have a voice in setting goals for the education of children, we must do a great deal more to inspire public confidence in us.

Yet another aspect of the problem of goals is that early childhood education has been oversold. We have exaggerated the power of early experiences to determine and to predict later development. This is difficult to admit when you are a specialist in early education! But we simply cannot be certain that we can teach a child something at the age of three or four years that will last him all his life. In the same way, we know that a pregnant woman needs a good diet for the new organism to be healthy. But this prenatal care does not mean that the child can't get rickets when he's four or six years old. He needs optimum nutrition all through his growth—all through the crucial years of development. There is no way to give children experiences in the preschool period which will protect them from all later catastrophes. The converse of this position is also true: if you meet a child at the age of ten whose development is not going well, you can still help him, and set his growth off to a better course. Development is not as irreversible as we had once believed. You cannot really predict from early experience much about what a child will be like later, *unless* the child's environment, particularly interpersonal environment, stays the same. I am suggesting that early education is very important, but it is not more important than all later education.

Returning to the interpersonal environment, the most continuous and constant impact upon a child's environment is made by parents. They have a way of staying around and hammering away at the same old things! Parents do have long-range impacts on their children, so that it seems to me one of our goals has to be to inspire the confidence a parent has in his child. If a parent has deep down confidence in the future of his child, it will carry him a long way. First grade reading methods do not! Remember that we must show, we must demonstrate to parents, that their children have a chance to succeed in coping with life. I cannot imagine anything more disheartening than an expectation of hopelessness and failure for one's own child. If we can

do something substantive to increase parents' confidence in their children's future, we will have done a great deal for their children.

When we have agreed upon which goals make sense, then we can take up this question: What do we have to do to make these things happen? I would like to explore this question briefly in terms of qualities of programs.

The first point I want to make here is that the classroom be an *open* one. Let me add quickly that *open* does not mean *empty*. A magnificent example of this is what is happening in about 30% of the Infant (5-7 years old) Schools in England. Very exciting things are happening in these classes – even in very old buildings, with little modern equipment or materials. These classrooms are open in the sense that children may pursue their own spontaneous interests. But they are not open in terms of standards. The children are encouraged, and expected to explore their own interests with great care, with attention to accuracy, to detail, to aesthetic form, and with the thoroughness appropriate to their ages. Children are expected to do whatever interests them, but to do so extremely well. The children certainly seem to get great satisfaction from their work, and they work very hard.

Another quality of these open classrooms is that reading, writing and mathematics are acquired by children as *tools with which to study their environment*. They do not use the environment for the purpose of studying reading and mathematics. This is a subtle but significant distinction in approaches to early education.

Another point I want to make about qualities of programs concerns the distinction between children having *fun* versus getting *satisfaction*. We must organize classroom environments so that young children can get satisfaction from hard work, from problem solving, exploring, inquiring, constructing and thinking. I am not against fun! But in early childhood education we seem to have exaggerated the role of fun (and ecstasy) in the child's experience. Teachers and designers of every type of curriculum model say "the children are having a ball." I am suspicious of that kind of evaluation. We cheat young children when we fail to engage them with us in the solid and satisfying processes of creating, constructing, problem-posing and problem solving. This qualitative distinction seems very striking to me when observing the modern Infant Schools in Britain. Educators must always be careful not to confuse enthusiasm with learning!

At this point I would like to comment on the great pressure we are experiencing in early education to use what we call reinforcement, or behavior modification techniques. One of the most important facts about reinforcing techniques is that they "work." Because they "work," the question of goals becomes very important. Most of us who are veteran early childhood educators find this approach to early education distasteful; we prefer a dynamic view of behavior and development. However, just because we *talk* about the dynamics of development does not mean that we are not, in fact, reinforcing, extinguishing and shaping behavior! It is really more virtuous to reinforce behavior without identifying or specifying which behaviors they are?

What is of greater concern to me is that these powerful techniques for shaping the behaviors of young children are used without sufficient consideration for the meaning of behavior. Let's take as an example, the disruptive child. If there are three children, all being disruptive, you might find three different meanings for these behaviors. One child might behave this way because he has been reinforced for this behavior in the past. Another child, engaging in the same behavior, might be expressing an emotional injury of some kind – anxieties or fears he is trying to cope with. Another child, showing the same behavior, might simply lack knowledge or skill for an alternative way of behaving; no one has socialized him toward a more appropriate behavior for the situation.

Now for these three different genotypes, i.e. different geneses of the same behavior, different treatments are needed. Only for the first type is behavior modification a suitable teaching method. The undesirable behavior can be extinguished. For the second genotype – an emotional injury – behavior modification will "work." The be-

children when we fail to engage them with us in the solid and satisfying processes of creating, constructing, problem-posing and problem solving. This qualitative distinction seems very striking to me when observing the modern Infant Schools in Britain. Educators must always be careful not to confuse enthusiasm with learning!

At this point I would like to comment on the great pressure we are experiencing in early education to use what we call reinforcement, or behavior modification techniques. One of the most important facts about reinforcing techniques is that they "work." Because they "work," the question of goals becomes very important. Most of us who are veteran early childhood educators find this approach to early education distasteful; we prefer a dynamic view of behavior and development. However, just because we *talk* about the dynamics of development does not mean that we are not, in fact, reinforcing, extinguishing and shaping behavior! It is really more virtuous to reinforce behavior without identifying or specifying which behaviors they are?

What is of greater concern to me is that these powerful techniques for shaping the behaviors of young children are used without sufficient consideration for the meaning of behavior. Let's take as an example, the disruptive child. If there are three children, all being disruptive, you might find three different meanings for these behaviors. One child might behave this way because he has been reinforced for this behavior in the past. Another child, engaging in the same behavior, might be expressing an emotional injury of some kind – anxieties or fears he is trying to cope with. Another child, showing the same behavior, might simply lack knowledge or skill for an alternative way of behaving; no one has socialized him toward a more appropriate behavior for the situation.

Now for these three different genotypes, i.e. different geneses of the same behavior, different treatments are needed. Only for the first type is behavior modification a suitable teaching method. The undesirable behavior can be extinguished. For the second genotype – an emotional injury – behavior modification will "work." The behavior will go, but the injury will still be there, a new manisfestation will appear, and the injury will take its toll another way. For this child, a cathartic experience is needed; a chance to express his fears or anxieties while he acquires new skills. For the third genotype, inadequate socialization, the child needs a teacher; straightforward guidance in how to solve the problem at hand more effectively. He does not need operant conditioning, he simply needs some teaching. After all, this is what teaching is about; helping the learner, at whatever age or stage, in such a way that he can solve the problems he meets *when you are not there!*

Another question I want to raise is: What qualities of *teachers* are needed to realize the goals we have? In early education we have *four* role models. In the past, a major one was the maternal model – the teacher who kept children safe, comfortable, happy and perhaps amused, and generally substituted for the mother. This model was not sufficiently stimulating for children. We have also had a therapeutic model, emphasizing children's needs for expression and understanding. We now seem to have a division between two other role models: the instructional and facilitator models.

The instructional model is the traditional approach to teaching as information giver, task setter and skill-drill supervisor.

The teachers of the open-classroom probably exemplify a little of all three of the models mentioned above. But she is primarily a *facilitator* of learning. She has the responsibility of alerting the child to those events and phenomena in his environment which are potentially instructive, interesting and worth knowing about. She also makes demands and sets expectations for children concerning how they address their energies to these instructive phenomena. This combination of being *both* encouraging and exacting seems to be very difficult for our teachers to grasp.

It seems to me that teachers must exemplify all those qualities which they wish to stimulate in children. This sounds like a cliche, but is nevertheless important. Wherever I go I ask teachers what they want to have happen to the

children they work with. Invariably they give me four goals: (1) They want children to love learning. (2) They want children to have a positive self-image. (3) They want children to realize their full potentials. (4) They want children to learn to get along with others.

If this is what we, as teachers, want for our children, then we must exemplify these qualities. So we might ask ourselves: Do we really love learning? How does this show? How much learning (or changing) do we do? How much do we seek knowledge? How curious are we? Do we find the universe interesting?

If we want children to have positive self-images, it may help for us to have them too. This is hard nowadays. Teachers are easy targets, and with our recent publicity under the headings "Murder in the Schoolroom," "Death at an Early Age," "Why Children Fail," etc., we are unlikely to feel very positive about ourselves or our work.

It seems to me finally that teachers must be able to combine two important personal qualities in order to realize their goals! They must be *both* warm *and* strong in their relations with children. One of these qualities alone will not help children to learn. To be loving and kind is not enough for a child to grow on. Children can only grow on the love of someone they can look up to, and they cannot look up to someone they can walk over. The young child needs a teacher who is caring, warm and sensitive, but who can as well make demands upon him. Do not make demands upon children you do not care for, because that is tyranny, and *tyranny is not good for children.*

The last question I want to raise is: What qualities of the system or administration have to exist in order to make our goals happen? I think it can be supported from research that the leadership style of the administrator (supervisor, project coordinator, or superintendent) can be seen fairly precisely if you observe how teachers interact with their children and their colleagues. If you don't like the way a teacher is relating to her colleagues, or her children, ask yourself if this is not an extension of your own leadership style! There may be more transfer than we wish to admit.

Another factor of importance here is a dimension called administrative smoothness-versus-friction. I don't know how it is in your state, but in many other parts of the country a great deal of time and energy is lost in squabbling, in-fighting and petty arguments. This seems especially true of programs which must suffer the uncertainties of year-to-year funding.

If it is true that there is continuity in the friction generated at upper administrative levels all the way down to the young children, then they are the powerless victims of adult frustration. The point is that the *children cannot put a stop to this. Adults have to break the flow of bitterness and friction.* So, if you happen to know of any places where there is administrative friction, please ask the parties involved to *rise above it* and get to work on behalf of the young child who depends entirely upon us to provide experiences to grow on. I might add here that the reverse sequence is also true; when you see successful and productive relations between teachers and children, you can invariably find administrative support and smoothness. After all, an administrator is very important; when his work is good, he makes it possible for the really important things to happen!

To those of you who have direct responsibility for teachers, I want to suggest that it may help to think of teachers as having at least four developmental stages. For the first stage, that of the new teacher, the main task is find out whether she can survive, whether she can manage the classroom without major catastrophes. At this stage she needs direct support, guidance and encouragement in context. In stage two, perhaps a year or more later when she feels sure she can manage and has been accepted by her colleagues, she begins to ask questions about individual problem children; she wants to know if her children are learning, and wants help with those questions. There is hopefully a third stage, perhaps by five years, when she feels tired of doing the same old things and wants to know about new ideas, new developments in techniques, materials and curriculum in general. At this stage she needs opportunities to attend workshops and conferences and exchange ideas

avariably they give
nt children to love
hildren to have a
y want children to
. (4) They want
g with others.
chers, want for our
plify these qualities.
Do we really love
show? How much
ve do? How much
w curious are we?
eresting?
have positive self-
have them too. This
re easy targets, and
nder the headings
"Death at an Early
tc., we are unlikely
rselves or our work.
at teachers must be
nt personal qualities
! They must be *both*
ations with children.
will not help chil-
ng and kind is not
v on. Children can
meone they can look
up to someone they
hild needs a teacher
nsitive, but who can
n him. Do not make
u do not care for,
tyranny is not good

nt to raise is: What
dministration have to
oals happen? I think
n research that the
nistrator (supervisor,
erintendent) can be
bserve how teachers
and their colleagues.
teacher is relating to
dren, ask yourself if
your own leadership
ransfer than we wish

Another factor of importance here is a dimension called administrative smoothness-versus-friction. I don't know how it is in your state, but in many other parts of the country a great deal of time and energy is lost in squabbling, in-fighting and petty arguments. This seems especially true of programs which must suffer the uncertainties of year-to-year funding.

If it is true that there is continuity in the friction generated at upper administrative levels all the way down to the young children, then they are the powerless victims of adult frustration. The point is that the *children cannot put a stop to this. Adults have to break the flow of bitterness and friction.* So, if you happen to know of any places where there is administrative friction, please ask the parties involved to *rise above it* and get to work on behalf of the young child who depends entirely upon us to provide experiences to grow on. I might add here that the reverse sequence is also true; when you see successful and productive relations between teachers and children, you can invariably find administrative support and smoothness. After all, an administrator is very important; when his work is good, he makes it possible for the really important things to happen!

To those of you who have direct responsibility for teachers, I want to suggest that it may help to think of teachers as having at least four developmental stages. For the first stage, that of the new teacher, the main task is find out whether she can survive, whether she can manage the classroom without major catastrophes. At this stage she needs direct support, guidance and encouragement in context. In stage two, perhaps a year or more later when she feels sure she can manage and has been accepted by her colleagues, she begins to ask questions about individual problem children; she wants to know if her children are learning, and wants help with those questions. There is hopefully a third stage, perhaps by five years, when she feels tired of doing the same old things and wants to know about new ideas, new developments in techniques, materials and curriculum in general. At this stage she needs opportunities to attend workshops and conferences and exchange ideas with others. At maturity, some time after five years, teachers become interested in their philosophical and historical roots. Big questions about the nature of childhood and learning are raised. From this brief outline of stages, you can see that our traditional teacher training curricula are upside-down, if not irrelevant.

I really believe that most teachers want to do well, want to help children, want to succeed, want to enjoy and be proud of their work. Whatever part you can play in supporting and strengthening their efforts will ultimately help the children who depend so totally upon us.

S. ALAN COHEN

Associate Professor
Yeshiva University
New York, New York

How to Teach Poor Blacks and Rich Whites to Read

S. Alan Cohen

Introduction

Meet the classroom teacher, that charismatic Mother Earth – that master motivator, alter ego, psychiatrist and social worker, father figure, insurance salesman, Renaissance Man concerned with the whole child –

his morals
his sex habits
his mother's sex habits
his relationship with siblings
his neurological organization
his nutrition
his race
his laterality
his automobile driving habits
his perceptual motor development
his narcotics habit
his self-image
his father's self-image
his language patterns (especially if he is black)
and, of course, his IQ.

This list of teacher concerns reflects the state of the art and pseudoscience of reading instruction, a sad state of affairs, indeed.

What's Missing?

Problem: How to teach poor blacks and rich whites to read.

Consider the problem and peruse the list of teacher concerns just presented. Do you notice anything missing in them?

Perhaps not. We have spent 40 years of education courses and hundreds of millions of war-on-poverty dollars establishing these variables as the guts of reading instruction. Even the International Reading Association believes that the teacher's concerns for the whole child are the gut issues in reading instruction today. Just read IRA's two most recent publications on teaching reading to the disadvantaged.[1,2] When you finish reading them ask yourself, what's missing?

Have you read the literature on reading disability? See Albert Harris's excellent collection of case studies from leading clinics around the country.[3] Among these case studies can be found diagnoses that describe daddy's sexual impotence, direction of the child's hair whorl, grandfather's illiteracy, soft signs, aphasia, developmental dyslexia and poor auditory sequencing (which really means lousy performance on the WISC Digit Span subtest). Read this amusing book and then ask yourself through your tears, what's missing?

Look back at those exciting, love-them-to-literacy education professors who held you spellbound bi-weekly in such intellectual adventures as Methods of Teaching Language Arts. What was missing?

I'll tell you what was missing – PEDAGOGY. We are drowning in oversophisticated labels, and etiological descriptions, but where are the pedagogical systems? PEDAGOGY – a word we use to describe the behaviors to be taught and the specific methods and materials for teaching them. PEDAGOGY is missing. PEDAGOGY is the bastard child of education and my purpose today is to try to win back a little legitimacy for that forgotten outcast, PEDAGOGY.

Etiologies and the Whole Child

I do *not* suggest that the ingredients of the whole child and the etiologies of such "anomalies" as reading retardation or the disadvantaged condition are inaccurate. I merely want to emphasize that if our job is to teach children to read, then the
factors are larg
irrelevant, and
view is abunda

To summari
ples of learnin
of etiologies
Intensive instr
read. It does n
tion of psycho
namic and psy
A child can b
His oral langu
the teacher's.
a breech birth
less home. He
on Marianne
obvert, revers
ures. He can
marble board
still learn to re
this consistent

PEDAGO
ature because
and from tho
country. The
what to do ab
classrooms.

Teacher Tra of Reading

1. The Re
mentary scho
all the core
long as the
have to maste
fake it. That
classroom in
an expert in s
and as a mast
pedagogical
Ridiculous!
teachers in a
lectual dema
technical de
gogical syste
on the norm
tained classr

Consider the problem and peruse the list of teacher concerns just presented. Do you notice anything missing in them?

Perhaps not. We have spent 40 years of education courses and hundreds of millions of war-on-poverty dollars establishing these variables as the guts of reading instruction. Even the International Reading Association believes that the teacher's concerns for the whole child are the gut issues in reading instruction today. Just read IRA's two most recent publications on teaching reading to the disadvantaged.[1,2] When you finish reading them ask yourself, what's missing?

Have you read the literature on reading disability? See Albert Harris's excellent collection of case studies from leading clinics around the country.[3] Among these case studies can be found diagnoses that describe daddy's sexual impotence, direction of the child's hair whorl, grandfather's illiteracy, soft signs, aphasia, developmental dyslexia and poor auditory sequencing (which really means lousy performance on the WISC Digit Span subtest). Read this amusing book and then ask yourself through your tears, what's missing?

Look back at those exciting, love-them-to-literacy education professors who held you spellbound bi-weekly in such intellectual adventures as Methods of Teaching Language Arts. What was missing?

I'll tell you what was missing – PEDAGOGY. We are drowning in oversophisticated labels, and etiological descriptions, but where are the pedagogical systems? PEDAGOGY – a word we use to describe the behaviors to be taught and the specific methods and materials for teaching them. PEDAGOGY is missing. PEDAGOGY is the bastard child of education and my purpose today is to try to win back a little legitimacy for that forgotten outcast, PEDAGOGY.

Etiologies and the Whole Child

I do *not* suggest that the ingredients of the whole child and the etiologies of such "anomalies" as reading retardation or the disadvantaged condition are inaccurate. I merely want to emphasize that if our job is to teach children to read, then these etiologies and developmental factors are largely irrelevant. They are true but irrelevant, and the data to support this point of view is abundant.[4,5,6,7]

To summarize these sources: Certain principles of learning apply to organisms regardless of etiologies and child development theories. Intensive instruction teaches most children to read. It does not matter what peculiar combination of psychophysical, psychosocial, psychodynamic and psycholinguistic factors are present. A child can be a victim of racism and poverty. His oral language patterns can be different from the teacher's. He could have been the victim of a breech birth, a castrating mother, or a fatherless home. He can flunk four out of five sub-tests on Marianne Frostig's test. He can constrict, obvert, reverse and distort Bender Gestalt figures. He can perform poorly on Archie Silver's marble board and digit span test. And he can still learn to read well, and the data demonstrates this consistently.

PEDAGOGY is what's missing from the literature because it is missing from teacher training and from thousands of classrooms across the country. The remainder of this paper will discuss what to do about this in teacher training and in classrooms.

Teacher Training for Teachers of Reading

1. The Renaissance Man is dead. An elementary school teacher cannot adequately teach all the core subjects. He must specialize. As long as the elementary school teacher did not have to master any pedagogical system, he could fake it. That fake is known as the self-contained classroom in which one human being poses as an expert in science, math, reading, social studies and as a master technician skilled in the various pedagogical systems used in each content area. Ridiculous! If we are to train elementary school teachers in a pedagogical system, then the intellectual demands of one content area, and the technical demands of one well-designed pedagogical system is more than a reasonable demand on the normal classroom teacher. The self-contained classroom must go.

2. Courses in principles of teaching do not make teachers. Eliminate all teacher training courses in principles of teaching.

3. Stop pretending that we know how to change attitudes and perceptions, and that teachers' attitudes and perceptions must change before they can teach effectively. Psychologists do not know how to change attitudes and perceptions. Chemotherapy, T-groups and even trauma therapy are notoriously unsuccessful. With it all, whites are still racists. They have biased expectancies of blacks, and very little seems to change that. Black teachers are people too. Their perceptions of black students are at least as distorted as their white colleagues.'s

Instead of trying to change attitudes and perceptions of teachers, train them to teach, for example, auditory discrimination of sounds in words using a specific set of materials in a specific way. Perhaps *after the fact*, you might see a change in perceptions. Changes in attitudes and perceptions *do not* necessarily precede behavior changes. I am suggesting just the opposite: Behavior modification precedes changes in perceptions and attitudes.

4. Practice precedes principles. This is merely an extension of the previous point in item #3. Practice precedes theory. Shaping teacher behaviors is the best way to teach learning theory.

5. Eliminate Ed Psych from the teacher training curriculum and introduce a full year of experimental psychology in the rat lab. Run rats, chimps and even people, and bring 50 years of learning know-how into the school room.

6. After eliminating principles of education courses and firing all the education professors who are "generalists," and purging the "eclectics," collect a staff of highly biased specialists (none of whom need to agree with each other) not to educate your teachers, but to *train* them to do certain things in a specific way. This means to teach them systems. Systems differ from methods not in components but in process. Both a system and a method involve three components: a teacher, pupils and materials or resources. The difference between a method and a system is that the former occurs when an accidental conglomeration of resources and a peculiar combination of student behaviors dictate an almost unpredictable process. A system, on the other hand, dictates methods or resources, student behaviors and teacher behaviors.

7. Now deliver that system to the school room. A set of resources (materials), a set of strategies for manipulating pupils and resources in a specific way, and an environmental manager to operate those specific resources constitute a system.

Specifically for the Ghetto

8. Train teachers in the ghetto. Set up colleges in store fronts and old factories. Train teachers in real classrooms not antiseptic teacher college demonstration schools. Keep the college professors away and use clinical professors to do on-the-job-training.

9. Beware of social change agents. They talk big and carry small sticks. Train your teachers how to teach children to read, write and do arithmetic. They can be revolutionists *after* 3 p.m.

10. Eliminate the trivia. Eliminate lesson plans, for the traditional lesson violates the most basic laws of learning. Stop all the nonsense about how professionals dress, tie or no tie, jacket or no jacket. Prepare your teachers for four-letter words. Prepare them for the real world.

11. Prepare yourself for the new ghetto — all black community control. Put on black face, or get another assignment, or at least prepare yourself to work for a black boss because the balance of power will change.

Necessary Ingredients of A Reading Instructional System

Two factors determine the effectiveness of a teaching system: content and pedagogy. I will concentrate on pedagogy, not because content is less important, but because pedagogy is safer to

teaching do not
teacher training
g.

e know how to
tions, and that
ons must change
ly. Psychologists
ttitudes and per-
roups and even
sly unsuccessful.
cists. They have
. and very little
achers are people
k students are at
e colleagues.'[8]

ge attitudes and
hem to teach, for
ion of sounds in
f materials in a
fact, you might
anges in attitudes
arily precede be-
ng just the oppo-
cedes changes in

nciples. This is
revious point in
theory. Shaping
st way to teach

rom the teacher
duce a full year
the rat lab. Run
nd bring 50 years
school room.

ples of education
ication professors
rging the "eclec-
biased specialists
with each other)
but to *train* them
ecific way. This
s. Systems differ
nts but in process.
nvolve three com-
d materials or re-

sources. The difference between a method and a system is that the former occurs when an accidental conglomeration of resources and a peculiar combination of student behaviors dictate an almost unpredictable process. A system, on the other hand, dictates methods or resources, student behaviors and teacher behaviors.

7. Now deliver that system to the school room. A set of resources (materials), a set of strategies for manipulating pupils and resources in a specific way, and an environmental manager to operate those specific resources constitute a system.

Specifically for the Ghetto

8. Train teachers in the ghetto. Set up colleges in store fronts and old factories. Train teachers in real classrooms not antiseptic teacher college demonstration schools. Keep the college professors away and use clinical professors to do on-the-job-training.

9. Beware of social change agents. They talk big and carry small sticks. Train your teachers how to teach children to read, write and do arithmetic. They can be revolutionists *after* 3 p.m.

10. Eliminate the trivia. Eliminate lesson plans, for the traditional lesson violates the most basic laws of learning. Stop all the nonsense about how professionals dress, tie or no tie, jacket or no jacket. Prepare your teachers for four-letter words. Prepare them for the real world.

11. Prepare yourself for the new ghetto — all black community control. Put on black face, or get another assignment, or at least prepare yourself to work for a black boss because the balance of power will change.

Necessary Ingredients of A Reading Instructional System

Two factors determine the effectiveness of a teaching system: content and pedagogy. I will concentrate on pedagogy, not because content is less important, but because pedagogy is safer to change. If we decided to change content, Dick, Sally and Spot would go and Leland Jacobs would be in. Silas Marner would be out and Herman Hesse would be in. The curriculum would be relevant, and we'd all be out of jobs because relevancy educates children, and educated children grow up to be dissatisfied adults — dissatisfied with irrelevancies. Such educated misfits tend to perceive ABM's, SSTP's and unstable Indochinese governments irrelevant in the light of such stark relevancies as racism, pollution, generation gap, urban decay, dope addiction and political graft and dishonesty.

So we'll stick to Run, Spot, Run, predicate nominatives and national norms on the Metropolitan Achievement Test. We'll concentrate on a pedagogy that works well with an irrelevant curriculum and would work even better with a relevant curriculum.

1. Divide reading instruction into three or four areas. We use Word Study (word analysis and vocabulary), Comprehension and Work Study Skills. Divide each area into subskills. We have divided each area into 10 or 12 subskills.

2. Further divide each subskill into operationally defined instructional or behavioral objectives. One of the major obstacles to effective learning in American classrooms is the schoolman's inability (Or is it his refusal?) to define what behaviors he is trying to shape in his children. For example, don't say you want children to love books. Read Mager's book[9] and operationally redefine that admirable desire into a behavioral objective such as:

> Given 30 minutes during which he may choose one of six activities, the student chooses to read a trade book from the class library of 300 books, spending three out of five such activity periods per week in this endeavor.

Can you appreciate the pedagogical implications of defining the ambiguous "love of books" in these behavioral terms? How many teachers do you know who claim they teach "love of books" and yet they do not have:

a. a 30-minute reading activity period daily with trade, not text books?

b. free choice of activities?

c. 300 children's trade books?

d. an observation scheme for assessing which kids are with it?

Defining objectives behaviorally puts the teacher more than 50% down the road to pedagogical success. And it forces each of us to face up to what we *really* do to children not what we *think* we do.

3. Code all the materials including page numbers, card numbers and item numbers to each instructional objective. This will show you what kinds of materials you presently have and how little most classrooms are equipped with. Now, at least, you have an idea of the types of resources you need to purchase.

4. Make up a set of test items or an observation scheme for each instructional objective. Go to the materials catalogued under each objective and take sample items directly from the materials.

5. Administer the tests in some sort of rational, logical, systematic order to begin to build a diagnostic picture of each child's reading behaviors. If you do this, you will discover huge differences among students. So you may decide to group homogeneously, after which you will discover the range of differences in each group is just as great. So you will break down your homogeneous group into canaries, pigeons and vultures, after which you will discover that 15% of your vultures on any reading subskill will perform better than 50% of your canaries.

The Moment of Truth: You are now faced with that horrible reality that everyone talks about but no one confronts – the damn kids are different! No matter how you group, no matter how you team your teachers, no matter how round or square your new school house, the instructional needs of each child are different. Here you stand – one teacher and 30 kids with each one's list of instructional objectives different from the other, and you have yet to throw into the picture such factors as different interests and temperaments. This is the moment of truth we've been avoiding for decades.

Arlie Cox, S. Alan Cohen, and R. A. Horn

6. The *Content* of what each child must learn, the *Level* at which he learns and his *Rate* of learning must now be tailored to each child.[10] That requires . . .

a. a variety of materials in small quantities (one or two copies) catalogued to the bank of instructional objectives.

b. each piece of material designed so that the learning stimuli and feedback to the learner (telling him the appropriateness of his response) is delivered by the material itself.

c. the teacher separate the delivery of the stimuli and feedback from himself. Otherwise, he cannot adjust the content, level and rate of instruction for each child. The classroom offers hardware, software and studentware to deliver the stimuli and feedback.

7. Every activity the child performs involves some type of instructional response sheet. Every activity completed is recorded on a progress

ssessing which

ally puts the
road to peda-
h of us to face
n not what we

ncluding page
m numbers to
will show you
ently have and
equipped with.
of the types of

or an observa-
l objective. Go
each objective
m the materials.

me sort of ra-
begin to build
d's reading be-
discover huge
ou may decide
which you will
in each group
eak down your
s, pigeons and
scover that 15%
g subskill will
r canaries.

are now faced
everyone talks
damn kids are
roup, no matter
no matter how
ool house, the
d are different.
nd 30 kids with
ectives different
t to throw into
fferent interests
noment of truth
s.

Arlie Cox, S. Alan Cohen, and R. A. Horn

6. The *Content* of what each child must learn, the *Level* at which he learns and his *Rate* of learning must now be tailored to each child.[10] That requires . . .

a. a variety of materials in small quantities (one or two copies) catalogued to the bank of instructional objectives.

b. each piece of material designed so that the learning stimuli and feedback to the learner (telling him the appropriateness of his response) is delivered by the material itself.

c. the teacher separate the delivery of the stimuli and feedback from himself. Otherwise, he cannot adjust the content, level and rate of instruction for each child. The classroom offers hardware, software and studentware to deliver the stimuli and feedback.

7. Every activity the child performs involves some type of instructional response sheet. Every activity completed is recorded on a progress plotter. All the record keeping is done by the pupil himself. The pupil works by himself or in small groups, but always in a self-directed manner.

8. As each child achieves his instructional objectives, more diagnostic tests of higher level objectives are given and the child moves on at his own rate.

Can it really be done? We've been doing it for almost ten years. Lots of people are doing it. In 1970, the publishing market is loaded with materials that do not require direct teacher supervision. The problem is that school systems continue to buy 30 copies of the same item (classroom sets) for everyone and assume that one publisher's program is really a pedagogical system. These schools continue to assume their teachers were taught something pedagogically useful in the colleges. These schools refuse to design reading systems built from the vast variety of materials currently available, and they refuse to hold their teachers accountable for operating such systems. So, the U.S. Office of Education

has finally resorted to performance contracting using a "turnkey" approach which allows boards of education to contract private corporations to enter their schools and implement such teaching systems. Unlike the AFT or NEA teacher, these companies accept accountability. They define the objectives and guarantee results, paying penalties when they fail and receiving bonuses when they succeed.

Conclusion

What I have suggested to you is that schools have failed children in so many ways. We see it most emphatically in the urban ghettos. There, millions of federal aid dollars have been largely misspent by educators in a way *designed* to deprive these children of basic literacy needs – in a way designed to line our own pockets in what has been the most lucrative political pork barrel since the military-industrial complex. This has only reinforced the self-defeating attitudes of these unfortunate and defenseless children, and the racist attitudes of the Moynihans, Nixons, the teachers who staff these schools and the professors who train them.

These racist attitudes in teachers and professors take the form of psychosocial, psychodynamic, psychophysical, psycholinguistic and even philosophical explanations of why urban blacks are so illiterate in fourth grade, and are just like other racist explanations, real, documented truths – truths which have no relevancy to the basic obligation of the school which is to teach these children to be literate enough to succeed in school.

Add to this the fallacious stereotypes and lies about language and cognitive deficits nurtured by distorted perceptions of some famous behavioral scientists who have only questionable data, and we find ourselves facing a national disaster in our cities.

In suburban ghettos, where we find the largest percentage of underachievers in the nation hiding behind achievement scores at the national norm, the symptoms are a little different. There, dope addiction has taken on epidemic proportions. Student unrest flares up as early as grade seven. The hippies and now the Weathermen draw their recruits not from Watts or Harlem, but from Cleveland Heights and Scarsdale. The disease is the same as in the urban ghetto. The curriculum is irrelevant, and even that curriculum is made more irrelevant by the school's refusal to tailor the irrelevancies to the individual differences of its students. As a result, the intensity of instruction is low; the school refuses to be accountable for achievement and refuses to offer a systems approach to learning.

The data from the urban ghettos, on the other hand, show us clearly and without equivocation that large numbers of disadvantaged children have learned to be literate and that the two reasons they learned are simple and concise:

1. Their teachers considered those sophisticated etiological conditions as interesting but irrelevant truths.
2. Their teachers implemented intensified instruction in basic literacy. They taught; they had a system.

The single greatest contribution to the war against racism and poverty that we, as professional educators, can make is to cut out the hogwash and teach these children to read and write and to do arithmetic and to do this without preconceived stereotypes about the effects of poverty and racism. From 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. think like educators and that means the 3 R's which are learned according to the same laws of learning as govern the learning of rich white kids.

References

1. Thomas D. Horn, *Reading for the Disadvantaged,* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1970.
2. J. Allen Figural, *Reading Goals for the Disadvantaged,* Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1970.
3. Albert Harris, *Casebook on Reading Disability,* New York: David McKay, 1970.
4. S. Alan Cohen and Anne M. Mueser, *Dyspedagogia In Urban Schools.* Paper presented at NCTE Annual Convention, Washington, D.C., November 29, 1969.
5. S. Alan Cohen, *Teach Them All To Read,* New York: Random House, 1969.
6. S. Alan
   Readin
   Learnin
7. S. Alan
   Readin
   Readin
   Washin
8. Ray C.
   Expecta
   Educati
   No. 3
9. Robert
   Palo Al
10. S. Alan
    York: R

seven. The hippies and now the Weathermen draw their recruits not from Watts or Harlem, but from Cleveland Heights and Scarsdale. The disease is the same as in the urban ghetto. The curriculum is irrelevant, and even that curriculum is made more irrelevant by the school's refusal to tailor the irrelevancies to the individual differences of its students. As a result, the intensity of instruction is low; the school refuses to be accountable for achievement and refuses to offer a systems approach to learning.

The data from the urban ghettos, on the other hand, show us clearly and without equivocation that large numbers of disadvantaged children have learned to be literate and that the two reasons they learned are simple and concise:

1. Their teachers considered those sophisticated etiological conditions as interesting but irrelevant truths.
2. Their teachers implemented intensified instruction in basic literacy. They taught; they had a system.

The single greatest contribution to the war against racism and poverty that we, as professional educators, can make is to cut out the hogwash and teach these children to read and write and to do arithmetic and to do this without preconceived stereotypes about the effects of poverty and racism. From 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. think like educators and that means the 3 R's which are learned according to the same laws of learning as govern the learning of rich white kids.

References

1. Thomas D. Horn, *Reading for the Disadvantaged,* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1970.
2. J. Allen Figural, *Reading Goals for the Disadvantaged,* Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1970.
3. Albert Harris, *Casebook on Reading Disability,* New York: David McKay, 1970.
4. S. Alan Cohen and Anne M. Mueser, *Dyspedagogia In Urban Schools.* Paper presented at NCTE Annual Convention, Washington, D.C., November 29, 1969.
5. S. Alan Cohen, *Teach Them All To Read,* New York: Random House, 1969.
6. S. Alan Cohen, "Studies in Visual Perception and Reading In Disadvantaged Children," *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* October, 1969.
7. S. Alan Cohen, "Dyspedagogia As A Cause of Reading Retardation: Definition and Treatment," *Reading Disability,* B. Bateman, editor, Seattle, Washington: Childhood Publications, 1970.
8. Ray C. Rist, "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education," *Harvard Educational Review,* Vol. 40, No. 3 (August, 1970), pp. 411-451.
9. Robert Mager, *Defining Instructional Objectives,* Palo Alto: Fearon Press, 1966.
10. S. Alan Cohen, *Teach Them All To Read,* New York: Random House, 1969, Chapter 11.

SHIRLEY McNEIL
Reading Supervisor
Detroit Public Schools
Detroit, Michigan

IDA KRAVITZ
Reading Supervisor
Philadelphia Public Schools
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

MARTIN L. STAHL

Superintendent
South-Western City Schools
Grove City, Ohio

Coordination of Regular and Special Programs

Martin L. Stahl

One would like to believe that special programs are not necessary in the educational process in our public schools. It would be nice to be optimistic and believe that the teacher alone can provide all the essential ingredients in the instructional receipe for each child. Thoughts such as these can be justified by the fact that the optimum goal of education is to take the child where he is and educate him to his fullest potential. This mandates individualization of instruction. This assumes that each teacher has the "know-how," has the dedication, has the ability to diagnose needs and problems of each child and is competent in prescribing procedures and materials which will result in each child being educated to the fullest. If these statements were true, then there would be no need for special programs. Each teacher would provide and each student receive the necessary education. Granted this is the perfect educational atmosphere . . .

Let's come down off "cloud 9" and be realistic. Educators know that there are many, many limitations which prevent the perfect educational climate. Educators know that most limitations are management in nature. We know that most of them are centered around the lack of financial resources and the failure of school districts to provide teachers with essential time to perform the necessary tasks for the perfect educational process. But these are not the only limitations. In some cases teachers lack the expertise and the understanding while others lack the necessary dedication for quality education. Human frailties also enter into the process.

With these facts being stated we realize then that it is impossible to achieve the perfection which we desire without utilizing special programs for assistance in overcoming all of the limitations with which educators are confronted. Limitations as stated above force the implementation of certain special programs to meet specific needs. Determination of needs seems to be the major step in the coordination process. However, there are several steps which complete total coordination. The steps may be listed as specific principles:

1. Coordination of special programs with regular programs involves the staff's perception of a need for special assistance. Teachers are human and they appreciate receiving things they desire while they rebel when things are forced upon them. This simply means that teachers will work very cooperatively when they want help. Conflicts in personalities and programs will be lessened and special programs will not be conducted in isolation if the help is requested.

   For example: The regular teacher realizes that he has children with specific reading problems which he alone cannot effectively overcome. He seeks assistance from a special reading program. The teacher's participation in seeking help automatically develops an attitude of cooperation which results in coordination between the regular program and the special program. We can further illustrate this by the teacher who has a child within his classroom with a speech impediment. The speech and hearing therapist is utilized. Various staff members become involved concerning the welfare of the child. The needs of the teacher and child are seen and they become very real.

   The examples cited may lead one to believe that coordination is easily accomplished, but it is not. We know that an effective program cannot be provided without proper coordina-

tion. The seek
further compli
since it place
teacher.

Determinati
process nor d
stance. There
developed pla
volves three
program deve
plished prior
needs.

(a) The distr
education
must be
paragrap
contain
direction
this cont
not only
tion an
methodol
tion of le
must set
"why" as
must be
for curri
tion. Th
gram an
with the
continuo
be paran
member
require
growth
of these
as the re
concern
ber is he
makes su
adapted

(b) The dis
to formu
objectiv
set mo
lines fo
These g

educational process. But these are not the only limitations. In some cases teachers lack the expertise and the understanding while others lack the necessary dedication for quality education. Human frailties also enter into the process.

With these facts being stated we realize then that it is impossible to achieve the perfection which we desire without utilizing special programs for assistance in overcoming all of the limitations with which educators are confronted. Limitations as stated above force the implementation of certain special programs to meet specific needs. Determination of needs seems to be the major step in the coordination process. However, there are several steps which complete total coordination. The steps may be listed as specific principles:

1. Coordination of special programs with regular programs involves the staff's perception of a need for special assistance. Teachers are human and they appreciate receiving things they desire while they rebel when things are forced upon them. This simply means that teachers will work very cooperatively when they want help. Conflicts in personalities and programs will be lessened and special programs will not be conducted in isolation if the help is requested.

   For example: The regular teacher realizes that he has children with specific reading problems which he alone cannot effectively overcome. He seeks assistance from a special reading program. The teacher's participation in seeking help automatically develops an attitude of cooperation which results in coordination between the regular program and the special program. We can further illustrate this by the teacher who has a child within his classroom with a speech impediment. The speech and hearing therapist is utilized. Various staff members become involved concerning the welfare of the child. The needs of the teacher and child are seen and they become very real.

   The examples cited may lead one to believe that coordination is easily accomplished, but it is not. We know that an effective program cannot be provided without proper coordination. The seeking of excellence in instruction further complicates the coordination process since it places greater demands upon the teacher.

   Determination of needs is not just a simple process nor does it come about by happenstance. There must be a workable, well-developed plan for direction. This plan involves three highly important phases of program development that must be accomplished prior to the determination of special needs.

   (a) The district must have a well defined educational philosophy. This philosophy must be more than just several flowering paragraphs of generalizations. It must contain the "meat" for establishing the direction for curriculum development. In this context curriculum concerns itself not only with concept (content) selection and organization but also with methodology – selection and organization of learning activities. The philosophy must set a framework for the "how" and "why" as well as "what." The philosophy must be used continuously as the basis for curriculum development and instruction. The implementation of each program and activity must be consistent with the district's philosophy. Therefore, continuous awareness of this phase must be paramount in the mind of each staff member. Determination of needs which require special assistance are an outgrowth of this philosophy. Coordination of these programs is made much easier as the result of common goals realized by concerned school personnel. Every member is headed in the same direction which makes supplemental programs more easily adapted to the regular program.

   (b) The district's philosophy must be used to formulate broad, general, district-wide objectives or goals. These are used to set more detailed instructional guidelines for the total educational program. These guidelines encourage realistic and

functional methods in the teaching-learning process.

The consistent direction provided through these guidelines specify (1) instructional techniques in the three areas of learning (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor) as well as (2) evaluative procedures. As with the philosophy, the goals must be referred to constantly for direction in total curriculum development. Thorough understanding of guidelines and goals that emphatically stress excellence for each child results in the teacher requesting and accepting "with open arms" the services provided by special programs. Lack of understanding on the part of the teacher frequently results in refusal of the service openly or through criticism; therefore, coordination of special and regular programs is most successful when all staff members understand the objectives and goals of the school system. For example, when a primary child in our district is experiencing difficulty with reading, the teacher is interested in knowing if there is a visual perception or auditory perception problem; if there is, the teacher will want him to have the assistance of a specialist to overcome this difficulty.

Cooperation can also be exerted in the evaluation process. If teachers are sincere in following the goals and guidelines, assistance will be requested voluntarily by them in the evaluation of their instructional progress. Then, modification of their expectations and instructional techniques will take place willingly as needed. Good feelings among all is gained and better teaching results.

(c) Behavioral objectives must be determined for each area of learning so that the teacher may see direction even more clearly than before. Behavioral objectives must be greatly detailed if the teacher and student are to clearly understand the what, why, and how in the teacher-learning process. The objectives clearly outline the expected learning out- come. These behavioral objectives ca readily be used as a yardstick for meas urement. Evaluation of pupil succes and teacher performance is mandatory i striving for excellence. Determination o unmet needs encourages teachers to seek methods which aid in successfully achiev ing the objectives. The sincere teache will ask for any assistance available through special programs; i.e., the stu dent who has difficulty in oral expressio in comprehension, in self-acceptance, o any of the myriad of problems encount ered needs extensive help from a specia ist who can give the time and th expertise necessary for change an growth.

Both the classroom teacher and th specialist have a common concern an both learn by cooperatively helping th child. The cooperation improves instru tion for the child and undoubtedly th classroom teacher improves his classroo performance for other children. Teache understanding why help is needed all viates conflicts and cooperation is mor readily obtained.

2. Methodology or instructional pedagogy mu be consistent with the district's philosoph The stated direction when followed force cooperative programs. It is difficult to sepa ate methodology from the philosophy, goal and objectives since instructional methods ar implied through the guidelines establishe Therefore, instruction will be somewhat d rected and consistent. This encourages assis ance from various personnel and program A very good example involves the thre domains of learning—the cognitive, the affe tive, and psychomotor. The cognitive hie archy very specifically suggests that instru tion must follow the critical thinking ap proach. Teaching must follow certain step which provide essential experiences for su cessful learning. This provides instructiona continuity between programs. Continu awareness of the affect brings out the huma

clearly outline the expected learning outcome. These behavioral objectives can readily be used as a yardstick for measurement. Evaluation of pupil success and teacher performance is mandatory in striving for excellence. Determination of unmet needs encourages teachers to seek methods which aid in successfully achieving the objectives. The sincere teacher will ask for any assistance available through special programs; i.e., the student who has difficulty in oral expression, in comprehension, in self-acceptance, or any of the myriad of problems encountered needs extensive help from a specialist who can give the time and the expertise necessary for change and growth.

Both the classroom teacher and the specialist have a common concern and both learn by cooperatively helping the child. The cooperation improves instruction for the child and undoubtedly the classroom teacher improves his classroom performance for other children. Teachers understanding why help is needed alleviates conflicts and cooperation is more readily obtained.

2. Methodology or instructional pedagogy must be consistent with the district's philosophy. The stated direction when followed forces cooperative programs. It is difficult to separate methodology from the philosophy, goals and objectives since instructional methods are implied through the guidelines established. Therefore, instruction will be somewhat directed and consistent. This encourages assistance from various personnel and programs. A very good example involves the three domains of learning—the cognitive, the affective, and psychomotor. The cognitive hierarchy very specifically suggests that instruction must follow the critical thinking approach. Teaching must follow certain steps which provide essential experiences for successful learning. This provides instructional continuity between programs. Continual awareness of the affect brings out the humanistic values in teaching the importance of attitudes toward the self, toward others, toward education, and toward all aspects of living. This implies that the teacher must serve as a model and behave in the way he would wish others to behave.

The awareness of the psychomotor domain causes the teacher to realize the importance of movement and integration of the nervous system for academic success as well as the importance of psychomotor activities in and of themselves through which the concert pianist, the professional football star, and the plumber earn their livings.

Therefore, when teachers, as well as students, see consistency and concern in education, teaching programs move more smoothly into action.

3. The administrative organization must so function that the major leadership is exerted at the local building level. To accomplish the aforementioned, it is necessary to have an effective and well integrated administration. It is my feeling that:
   (a) There must be much communication between all administration so that all have a part in developing the philosophy and the educational guidelines for the district. This will help insure understanding and acceptance of the philosophy and guidelines.
   (b) The principal must be the educational leader within his building. He cannot spend all of his time being a building manager who calls the busses, counts the lunch money, disciplines the children, etc. Instead, he must continuously work with his staff and students to see that the philosophy, goals and guidelines of the district are being effectively implemented.
   (c) Principals in larger schools must be provided with assistance in working with staff if the job is to be done. For this reason we have staff development teachers and department heads who are not mini-administrators, but who are master teachers. They work with other teachers to improve their performance.

(d) The school organization must also provide for the total involvement of staff. All staff members must know and feel, "This is our school, these are our children, these are our goals." When this occurs, problems in coordinating the regular programs with the special programs disappear.

You can plainly see that we want each staff member to see the educational Gestalt. Then you don't have feelings that Department A does this, Department B does that, and never the twain shall meet.

4. Inservice education must be so thorough that every staff member becomes involved in understanding the educational program. To develop this type of understanding, it is necessary to have an extensive, intensive and effective inservice education program. However, we look at inservice education in a different way. We feel that inservice education, as well as the educational experience of our children must be individualized. We must look at our administrative staff, our staff development teachers, and department heads to determine their strengths and weaknesses. We must determine what steps are needed for their improvement, the most effective way of bringing about this improvement, and ways of evaluating their change in knowledge and behavior.

   In turn, we expect them to follow the same procedure with their teachers.

   Thus, inservice education is not a series of meetings that take the "shot gun" approach to "improving" education. Instead, it is a well thought out, carefully tailored approach that is designed to bring about favorable changes in the lives of our boys and girls.

   Naturally, there will be some large group meetings, many small group meetings, and numerous individual conferences. However, we consider the most effective inservice education to take place through the informal contacts between people. The administrator must use each of his contacts in such a way as to increase the possibility that the philosophy and goals of the district will be achieved. Thus, he must live and breathe our philosophy and goals.

5. Communications involve much repetition through various approaches in order to achieve understanding. As you can see, we stress communication. If communication is to be effective:
   (a) All members of the administrative team must be communicating the same message. This requires much communication among all levels of administration.
   (b) The communication must be continuous, must emanate from many different sources, and must reinforce our philosophy.
   (c) The concepts being communicated must be demonstrated in the behavior of the communicator; i.e., the principal must not be sarcastic with the teacher when he is trying to get the teacher to not be sarcastic with children.

   You may think that I am overemphasizing communication, but I am not. You rarely bring about change in attitude and behavior through a meeting, a directive, or any one experience. Instead, change is brought about through intensive two-way communication which leads to acceptance, insight and implementation of particular modes of behavior. The first few meetings open only a small crack in the door of understanding while many, many sessions on the same topic hitting it from various approaches achieve success. The more sophisticated we become in knowledge of our field the more difficult it becomes to communicate a set pattern of guidelines.

6. Evaluation must take place for measurement of teacher and program progress in determining and meeting pupil needs. Frequently we are so ego involved and so busy trying to implement ideas, that we do not stand back and take a realistic look at the philosophy, the goals, and the functioning of our district. This is a heresy that we dare not commit! We must train our staff to function and always function as diagnosticians. We must con-

stantly as
ness. It
evaluatio
needs an
in a conti
through t
ated with
consider
incentive

To summ
tive coordi
have:
(a) A re
tiona
(b) This
the
goal
(c) Thes
flecte
tives
(d) To
havi
see t
prog
(e) In
we
stag

To accon
1. Inten
educa
2. An a
nimit
is larg
3. A co
cated
educa
for b
4. And
stress
objec

phy and goals of the district will be achieved. Thus, he must live and breathe our philosophy and goals.

5. Communications involve much repetition through various approaches in order to achieve understanding. As you can see, we stress communication. If communication is to be effective:
   (a) All members of the administrative team must be communicating the same message. This requires much communication among all levels of administration.
   (b) The communication must be continuous, must emanate from many different sources, and must reinforce our philosophy.
   (c) The concepts being communicated must be demonstrated in the behavior of the communicator; i.e., the principal must not be sarcastic with the teacher when he is trying to get the teacher to not be sarcastic with children.

   You may think that I am overemphasizing communication, but I am not. You rarely bring about change in attitude and behavior through a meeting, a directive, or any one experience. Instead, change is brought about through intensive two-way communication which leads to acceptance, insight and implementation of particular modes of behavior. The first few meetings open only a small crack in the door of understanding while many, many sessions on the same topic hitting it from various approaches achieve success. The more sophisticated we become in knowledge of our field the more difficult it becomes to communicate a set pattern of guidelines.

6. Evaluation must take place for measurement of teacher and program progress in determining and meeting pupil needs. Frequently we are so ego involved and so busy trying to implement ideas, that we do not stand back and take a realistic look at the philosophy, the goals, and the functioning of our district. This is a heresy that we dare not commit! We must train our staff to function and always function as diagnosticians. We must constantly assess our position and our effectiveness. It is through the constant process of evaluation that we can determine our unmet needs and thus provide the vitality that results in a continually improving educational system through the use of special programs coordinated with regular programs. We should not consider our shortcomings as disasters, but as incentives to be creative and to move forward.

To summarize, if we are going to have effective coordination between programs we must have:

(a) A realistic and practical common *educational philosophy.*
(b) This educational philosophy will lead to the development of specific *purposes and goals* of education.
(c) These purposes and goals will be reflected in the behaviorally stated objectives of teachers for the individual child.
(d) To realize these individually stated behavioral objectives, *regular teachers* will see the need for, ask for, and use *special programs and services.*
(e) In *evaluating* the behavioral objectives, we identify further need and set the stage for further growth.

To accomplish this we need:

1. Intensive formal and informal inservice education for administrators and teachers.
2. An administrative staff which has unanimity of direction, high motivation, and is large enough in size to get the job done.
3. A competent staff which is truly dedicated to providing the best possible *total educational,* not just academic, experience for boys and girls.
4. And much positive communication, which stresses the educational philosophy and objectives, between everyone.

JOSEPH L. DAVIS

Assistant Superintendent
Columbus Public Schools
Columbus, Ohio

Dissemination

Joseph L. Davis

As I began preparing this presentation, I found myself – for the first time in many a moon – grappling with a speech title consisting of one word, "Dissemination." Although everyone is familiar with this word, I concluded that I should check its dictionary meaning as the first step in my preparation. After all, I didn't want to drag a bass fiddle to this platform only to find that you and Ray Horn were expecting a flute solo.

So let's lay out the semantic dimensions of this topic before we begin to develop it. Much to my surprise, I discovered that Webster's 1969 Collegiate provides good 1960 definitions for dissemination, at least as those definitions apply to Title I programs. Webster's definitions can be summed up in three words: *to spread widely.*

Now I freely admit that *to spread widely* is the accepted definition of dissemination. However, that definition constitutes just about half of the umbrella for my presentation this morning. I plan to talk about dissemination as defined by Webster – and more.

Obviously, I am going to emphasize *spreading* the Title I story widely. But I shall also give as much attention – or nearly as much – to the receiving of the story by various audiences. After all, Rex Kern's value as a "disseminator" of passes depends heavily upon Bruce Jankowski's ability to receive the passes.

What we shall be considering is the complete act of communication. My one-time mentor at Ohio State University, Professor Ted Jenson, has said that there are six elements in communication: the idea or the information to be shared; the sender (that's you if you are a Title I disseminator); the message and its formulation; the media used to transmit the message; the receiver of the message; and the reacting to and interpretation of the message.

I do not intend to explore each of these six elements in detail this morning, but I do wish to concentrate on four basic considerations involved in organizing and conducting a well structured dissemination program. Of necessity, my remarks will be broad and general. I find it easier to get away with this when the program planners are thoughtful enough to schedule small-group discussions following a general session, as have the planners of this conference. I realize that although you come to a conference like this with general expectations, the only thing you take home with you are specific ideas and suggestions that have applicability in your own assignment. That's as it should be, and I encourage you to do three things with what I say from this platform:

- Accept and utilize those ideas that have application back home.
- Forget those that have no such application.
- Modify those that fall between these extremes to fit the circumstances in which you find yourself.

I harbor the belief that the more effective dissemination programs are the result of preplanning and organization. Specifically, I suggest that disseminators pose and answer four questions before warming up the mimeograph machine, phoning a newspaper reporter, reserving the school auditorium for a "dissemination" program, or requesting public service time on radio or TV. These questions are as follows:

1. What objectives should we try to achieve through dissemination activities?
2. Who are the audiences with whom we wish to conduct dissemination activities?
3. Wh
   invo
4. Wh
   avai

The k
are objecti

Objective

Let's t
dealing wi
necessity
activities.
waste of t
step. Obj
they give
a yardstic
measure p
of develo
tunity fo
parents, a

Since
objectives
please re
merely il

- To
  pro
- To
  cou
- To
  app
- To
  and
- To
  tion

If it m
I would
substanti
vided. I
for I wo
started f
tives uni

One
cast the
develop
Needs c
modified

What we shall be considering is the complete act of communication. My one-time mentor at Ohio State University, Professor Ted Jenson, has said that there are six elements in communication: the idea or the information to be shared; the sender (that's you if you are a Title I disseminator); the message and its formulation; the media used to transmit the message; the receiver of the message; and the reacting to and interpretation of the message.

I do not intend to explore each of these six elements in detail this morning, but I do wish to concentrate on four basic considerations involved in organizing and conducting a well structured dissemination program. Of necessity, my remarks will be broad and general. I find it easier to get away with this when the program planners are thoughtful enough to schedule small-group discussions following a general session, as have the planners of this conference. I realize that although you come to a conference like this with general expectations, the only thing you take home with you are specific ideas and suggestions that have applicability in your own assignment. That's as it should be, and I encourage you to do three things with what I say from this platform:

- Accept and utilize those ideas that have application back home.
- Forget those that have no such application.
- Modify those that fall between these extremes to fit the circumstances in which you find yourself.

I harbor the belief that the more effective dissemination programs are the result of preplanning and organization. Specifically, I suggest that disseminators pose and answer four questions before warming up the mimeograph machine, phoning a newspaper reporter, reserving the school auditorium for a "dissemination" program, or requesting public service time on radio or TV. These questions are as follows:

1. What objectives should we try to achieve through dissemination activities?
2. Who are the audiences with whom we wish to conduct dissemination activities?
3. What kinds of information do we wish to involve in our dissemination activities?
4. What kinds of dissemination media are available to us?

The key words to keep in mind as we proceed are objectives, audiences, information, and media.

Objectives

Let's turn now to the first question, the one dealing with objectives. You may question the necessity of drafting objectives for dissemination activities. You may view such an endeavor as a waste of time, but I regard it as an essential first step. Objectives helps us husband lean resources; they give us stars to steer by; and they provide a yardstick against which we can, if we desire, measure progress and achievement. The process of developing objectives also provides an opportunity for involvement on the part of teachers, parents, and possibly community spokesmen.

Since there is no substitute for "homemade" objectives for a Title I dissemination program, please regard the following list of objectives as merely illustrative:

- To promote understanding of the Title I program.
- To create awareness of problems being encountered in the program.
- To generate support for plans designed to approach such problems.
- To inspire confidence in the Title I program and Title I personnel.
- To encourage participation of the educational community in the Title I program.

If it makes sense to you to develop objectives, I would not be surprised if your items differed substantially from the illustrations I have provided. In fact, I would be pleased if they did, for I would take this as evidence that you had started from ground-zero and developed objectives unique to your situation.

One other word about objectives. Do not cast them in concrete, for the original list you develop should not be regarded as immutable. Needs change; Title I programs are expanded, modified, or dropped to meet changing circum-

stances; funding levels fluctuate. Be prepared to review dissemination objectives at least once annually, and don't be reluctant to follow the dictates of common sense in revising them.

Audiences

My second basic question dealt with audience identification. This step is advocated for two reasons. First, it can contribute to the development of a systematic and comprehensive dissemination program. It gives us a check list of potential recipients of each message to be disseminated, thus minimizing the chances that an important audience will be overlooked.

Perhaps the second reason for identifying audiences in advance is the more important of the two, since it relates to the tailoring of messages to meet specific audience requirements. Professor Scott Cutlip of the University of Wisconsin tells us that effective communication today involves such tailoring. The disseminator who has developed audience-consciousness stands a better chance of communicating than the one who has not. Faced with a dissemination activity, he asks himself, "What does this particular audience need to know or want to know?" as well as "What do I need to tell them or want to tell them?"

It is important that audience-identification be handled on a local basis. By that I mean that we shouldn't be surprised if the list drawn up by the Title I staff in Chillicothe differs from the one drawn up in Toledo. And, for that matter, there's no reason why the list of audiences for School A in Chillicothe should be identical to that of School B in Chillicothe.

What I am suggesting is that each school district engage in audience-identification at two levels: the central office and the individual school.

For examples of specific audiences, I wish to draw upon an experience I had in Dallas, Texas, early in August while serving in a resource capacity at the annual pre-school conference of the Dallas school administration. I met with several small groups of Dallas principals and supervisors. One of the things they did was to identify audiences with whom they needed to communicate. In these brainstorming sessions, they came up with 25 audiences, classified as follows:

- Internal
  1. Students
  2. Faculty
  3. Staff
- Internal-System
  1. Central administration
  2. Other schools in district
  3. Feeder school cluster
  4. School related agencies
  5. Private schools and colleges
  6. Other administrators
  7. Professional organizations
- External
  1. Parents
     (a) PTA
     (b) Dad's Club
     (c) Newcomers
     (d) Others
  2. Patrons (non-parents)
     (a) Senior citizens
     (b) Community leaders
     (c) Business leaders
     (d) Ministers
     (e) Attorneys
     (f) Doctors
  3. Ex-students
     (a) Dropouts
     (b) Graduates
  4. Community agencies and organizations
  5. Civic and service groups
  6. News media

To this list, I would add such important Title I audiences as:

- The officials of poverty and local welfare agencies.
- The board of education.
- The Title I staff at the State Department of Education.

Perhaps this extensive list will suggest some audiences you have back home. As you plan a dissemination activity, refer to your list of audiences, and ask yourself: "Which of these audiences should be involved in this dissemina-

tion activity
involve all
tivity. But
you will
audience
Always ren
activity sh
audiences,

Categori

The th
kinds of in
wish to di
topics can
in a compr

Admini
nine inform
their disse
are as follo
1. Polic
2. Progr
3. Peop
4. Probl
5. Plan
6. Priori
7. Perfo
8. Progr
9. Prais

In devel
I suggest t
vocated fo
you approa
and centra
cited for D
your list in
from time t
overplayin
thus under
you should

Media

My fou
media avai
of dissemi
three medi

- Face-t
- The

communicate. In these brainstorming sessions, they came up with 25 audiences, classified as follows:

- Internal
  1. Students
  2. Faculty
  3. Staff
- Internal-System
  1. Central administration
  2. Other schools in district
  3. Feeder school cluster
  4. School related agencies
  5. Private schools and colleges
  6. Other administrators
  7. Professional organizations
- External
  1. Parents
     (a) PTA
     (b) Dad's Club
     (c) Newcomers
     (d) Others
  2. Patrons (non-parents)
     (a) Senior citizens
     (b) Community leaders
     (c) Business leaders
     (d) Ministers
     (e) Attorneys
     (f) Doctors
  3. Ex-students
     (a) Dropouts
     (b) Graduates
  4. Community agencies and organizations
  5. Civic and service groups
  6. News media

To this list, I would add such important Title I audiences as:

- The officials of poverty and local welfare agencies.
- The board of education.
- The Title I staff at the State Department of Education.

Perhaps this extensive list will suggest some audiences you have back home. As you plan a dissemination activity, refer to your list of audiences, and ask yourself: "Which of these audiences should be involved in this dissemination activity?" Obviously, you will not want to involve all audiences in each dissemination activity. But by having the list in hand in advance, you will run less risk of overlooking a specific audience for a given dissemination activity. Always remember that your every dissemination activity should be developed in terms of specific audiences, and tailor the activity accordingly.

Categories

The third question I posed pertains to the kinds of information we need to disseminate or wish to disseminate. Categorizing information topics can help guarantee balance and variety in a comprehensive dissemination program.

Administrative personnel in Dallas identified nine information categories to be included in their dissemination program. These categories are as follows:

1. Policies
2. Programs
3. People
4. Problems
5. Plans
6. Priorities
7. Performance
8. Progress
9. Praise

In developing a list of information categories, I suggest that you follow the procedure I advocated for identifying audiences; namely, that you approach this task both at the building level and central-office level. The examples I have cited for Dallas may expedite your task. With your list in hand, you can check up on yourself from time to time to make sure that you are not overplaying one or two information subjects and thus underplaying others. Throughout the year, you should try to keep your subject matter varied.

Media

My fourth question related to dissemination media available to us as we carry out a program of dissemination activities. Broadly speaking, three media are available. They are as follows:

- Face-to-face relationships.
- The written word.

• The spoken word.

I have deliberately listed face-to-face relationships first for two reasons. First, because I sense that this is the dissemination medium preferred by a growing number of students, teachers, parents, and community spokesmen. And second, because face-to-face relationships bring the disseminator and receiver of information together on the same field at the same time. This makes it much easier for the disseminator to tailor his message to meet the specific needs of the receiver, for the latter is present to help him in the tailoring process. Remember my reference to the importance of Receiver Bruce Jankowski to Passer Rex Kern on the gridiron.

In summary, I wish to reiterate that four steps need to be observed in organizing a dissemination program: setting objectives, identifying audiences, categorizing information subjects, and delineating media of dissemination.

Levels of Dissemination

Now let's turn our attention to specific dissemination activities, techniques, and projects. After nearly two decades of experience in this area, I have concluded that these activities, techniques, and projects may be classified by levels. I have identified six levels, and I would like to describe them to you and offer illustrations of each.

Level I dissemination activities and techniques are the simplest and have the longest history behind them. At this level, the flow of communication is in one direction: from school to audience. The school takes the initiative; it provides information. The audience for which the information is intended receives it passively. Individuals or groups in the audience may respond, but, by and large, most Level I activities and techniques are not intended to elicit any overt response. They are designed to convey information deemed appropriate and important by the school.

Examples of Level I techniques and activities are letters, news releases, newsletters, annual reports, brochures, bulletins, the typical parent-teacher association meeting, and the typical luncheon speech of a school board member, superintendent, principal, or Title I supervisor or teacher.

At Level II, the school again is cast in the role of initiator, but the audience plays a more active role than it does in Level I dissemination techniques and activities. At Level II, the school opens its doors to the audience, and the audience visits the schools and observes what is going on. In most instances, the flow of communication again is in one direction: from school to audience. However, individuals or groups in the audience are in a better position to react to what they observe since they are in the school or on school property and in the presence of school personnel. They can be more fully involved.

Examples of Level II techniques and activities are the typical visit of a parent to observe his child's class while it is in session, open-house nights, exhibits, science fairs, dramatic and musical productions, and special luncheons and dinners.

In summary, Level I and Level II dissemination techniques and activities may be characterized by the school's providing information, demonstrations, or entertainment for audiences, which are completely or relatively passive at both of these levels.

Level III techniques and activities are less dependent upon the school as the initiator of communications with individuals or groups. Greater provision is made for the audience to initiate communications. The distinguishing characteristic at Level III is that representatives of the school and members of the audience enter into dialogue. This implies that the flow of communication is in two directions: from school to audience and from audience to school.

Examples of Level III techniques and relationships are telephone conversations, parent-teacher conferences, parent-principal conferences, parent-counselor conferences, visits of teachers to homes of their pupils, opinion surveys, press conferences, and radio and television "talk-back" programs.

At Level IV, the school may still exercise considerable influence over the format employed

luncheon speech of a school board member, superintendent, principal, or Title I supervisor or teacher.

At Level II, the school again is cast in the role of initiator, but the audience plays a more active role than it does in Level I dissemination techniques and activities. At Level II, the school opens its doors to the audience, and the audience visits the schools and observes what is going on. In most instances, the flow of communication again is in one direction: from school to audience. However, individuals or groups in the audience are in a better position to react to what they observe since they are in the school or on school property and in the presence of school personnel. They can be more fully involved.

Examples of Level II techniques and activities are the typical visit of a parent to observe his child's class while it is in session, open-house nights, exhibits, science fairs, dramatic and musical productions, and special luncheons and dinners.

In summary, Level I and Level II dissemination techniques and activities may be characterized by the school's providing information, demonstrations, or entertainment for audiences, which are completely or relatively passive at both of these levels.

Level III techniques and activities are less dependent upon the school as the initiator of communications with individuals or groups. Greater provision is made for the audience to initiate communications. The distinguishing characteristic at Level III is that representatives of the school and members of the audience enter into dialogue. This implies that the flow of communication is in two directions: from school to audience and from audience to school.

Examples of Level III techniques and relationships are telephone conversations, parent-teacher conferences, parent-principal conferences, parent-counselor conferences, visits of teachers to homes of their pupils, opinion surveys, press conferences, and radio and television "talk-back" programs.

At Level IV, the school may still exercise considerable influence over the format employed to facilitate communication between the school and some audience, but the audience clearly exercises greater influence over the substance of the communication than the school does. Level IV dissemination techniques and activities are structured so that members of the audience are encouraged to provide insights and advice on school policies, the school program, and school problems. The flow of communication is in two directions, with the audience being given the opportunity to generate the greater portion of the dialogue.

Perhaps the best example of Level IV techniques and activities is the typical advisory committee convened by a board of education or school administrator. In general, there are two kinds of advisory committees: *ad hoc* committees set up to study a problem and standing committees established to maintain communications on a continuous basis.

Other examples of Level IV techniques and activities include community forums, open hearings, the public-participation portion of school board meetings, and program planning and evaluation projects that make provision for lay participation.

In summary, Level III and Level IV dissemination techniques and activities may be characterized by the school's representatives and the representatives of some audience entering into give-and-take.

The most dramatic and far-reaching step in the progression from Level I to Level VI occurs between Levels IV and V. Although the audience is given a progressively larger role to play at each higher level through Level IV, the school unquestionably retains complete control of its own operations and decision-making at each of these levels. But the distinguishing characteristic at Level V is that members of the audience are provided an opportunity to participate in the planning and/or decision-making process on some school issues or in some areas of school operations.

At present, this level is fraught with uncertainties and confusion. Laymen and educators who see merit in providing for at least some

degree of neighborhood control within the district-wide governance structure of the school system are frustrated by a scarcity of experience in this area, legal restrictions, and the substitution of emotion for reason.

Level VI techniques and activities go a step further than Level V, but educators have found them easier to develop and maintain. Level VI provides for the involvement of laymen in the implementation of school programs and services.

Laymen are involved both as volunteer aides and as paid employees of the school system. They are most commonly used as classroom aides, clerical aides, library aides, lunchroom aides, and playground aides. In the classroom, they relieve the teacher of non-instructional tasks and help the teacher give concentrated attention to pupils needing extra help.

Although many schools have long made use of such aides, great impetus was given to this practice through enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The former provided for maximum feasible participation of the poor in the planning and implementation of projects, and both provided funds that hard-pressed school districts could use to employ lay aides. In poverty areas, many schools have found that such aides, whether paid or volunteers, soon become effective school information agents in the community.

In summary, Level V and Level VI techniques and activities may be characterized by active community participation in the life of the school.

Now that we are in the decade of the 1970's, it seems likely that school districts will need to develop more effective dissemination techniques and activities at Levels III through VI. However, this does not imply that techniques and activities at the other two levels can be abandoned, for a vigorous and well-balanced dissemination program requires the judicious use of techniques and activities at all six levels.

GEOR

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE
United States Senate

trol within the
ure of the school
city of experience
and the substitu-

tivities go a step
cators have found
intain. Level VI
of laymen in the
ams and services.
s volunteer aides
e school system.
sed as classroom
ides, lunchroom
In the classroom,
nstructional tasks
entrated attention

e long made use
was given to this
f the Economic
e Elementary and
965. The former
e participation of
mplementation of
funds that hard-
se to employ lay
ny schools have
r paid or volun-
chool information

Level VI tech-
characterized by
in the life of the

ade of the 1970's,
tricts will need to
nation techniques
hrough VI. How-
t techniques and
vels can be aban-
l-balanced dissem-
judicious use of
six levels.

GEORGE W. BAILEY,
Humorist

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE
United States Senate